1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
2	SOUTHERN DIVISION
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4	Plaintiff,
5	,
6	
7	
8	Defendant. /
9	JURY TRIAL - Volume 3
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE MATTHEW F. LEITMAN
11	United States District Judge Theodore Levin United States Courthouse
12	231 West Lafayette Boulevard Detroit, Michigan
13	Tuesday, November 15, 2022
14	APPEARANCES:
15	For the Plaintiff: JULES M. DEPORRE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
16	600 Church Street
17	Flint, MI 48502 (810) 766-5177
18	Also Present: Jessica Szukhent, United States Attorney's Office
19	
20	LONGSTREET LAW FIRM, PLLC
21	18971 Livernois Detroit, MI 48221
22	(313) 288-0103
23	
24	To obtain a copy of this official transcript, contact:
25	Robert L. Smith, Federal Official Court Reporter (313) 234-2612 • robert_smith@mied.uscourts.gov

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	<u>MATTER</u> PAGE
3	WITNESSES:
<i>4</i> 5	BLAKE A. PARKES Direct Examination by Mr. Longstreet
	Cross-Examination by Mr. DePorre10
6 7	OFFICER LOUIS VALEGA Direct Examination by Mr. Longstreet
8	<u>DEFENSE RESTS</u>
9	RULE 29 MOTION RENEWED23
10	OFFICER BRETT ORVIS
11	Direct Examination by Mr. DePorre
12	PROOFS CLOSED31
13	JURY INSTRUCTION
14	CLOSING ARGUMENTS by Mr. DePorre49
15	by Mr. Longstreet
16	FINAL JURY INSTRUCTIONS
17	<u> </u>
18	
19	
20	EXHIBITS: Offered Received
21	Defendant's Exhibit B 8 9
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
Detroit, Michigan
 2
      Tuesday, November 15, 2022
 3
      at about 9:52 a.m.
 4
 5
               (Court, Counsel and Defendant present.)
               THE CASE MANAGER: All rise.
 6
 7
               The United States District Court for the Eastern
 8
     District of Michigan is now in session, the Honorable
 9
     Matthew F. Leitman, United States District Judge, presiding.
10
               You may be seated.
11
               The Court calls Case No. 21-20405, United States of
12
     America v. Noe Garza.
13
               Counsel, please state your appearances for the
14
     record.
15
               MR. DePORRE: Good morning, Your Honor.
16
     Jules DePorre on behalf of the United States. With me at
17
     counsel table is Jessica Szuhkent, from the U.S. Attorney's
18
     Office, and Brett Orvis, the case agent in this matter.
19
               THE COURT: Good morning.
20
               MR. LONGSTREET: Good morning. May it please this
21
     Honorable Court, Charles Oliver Longstreet, II, P68205,
22
     appearing on behalf of Noe Garza, who is present and seated
23
     to my left.
24
               THE COURT: Good morning. Welcome to both of you.
25
               We are here for our second day of jury trial.
```

had an opportunity to meet with counsel in chambers to iron out the final jury instruction issues. The jury instructions are being printed right now and will be ready to go.

My understanding from the discussions with counsel is that, Mr. Longstreet, you and Mr. Garza do wish to call at

least one and maybe more witnesses; is that correct?

MR. LONGSTREET: That is accurate.

THE COURT: So my plan would be to bring our jury back in, and you can call your witnesses. And it sounds like, from our discussion, we don't anticipate a lengthy defense case in terms of time; is that fair?

MR. LONGSTREET: Twenty minutes, max.

THE COURT: And my thought -- and then Mr. DePorre, you were talking about a government rebuttal case, but also not a long one?

MR. DePORRE: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So what I want to tell the jurors is my plan is to get this case to them by lunch, which would mean you guys will present — start with the defense case, then the government's rebuttal case, and by then, I should have my set of jury instructions. I will give my instructions, and then I will give them a break, so they come back fresh with each of your closing arguments, and then we'll get the case to them, and they can do their lunch. Does that work for you?

```
It does. There is one additional
               MR. DePORRE:
 2
     matter; after the defense concludes with its two witnesses,
 3
     at some point I think it would be proper to voir dire the
 4
     defendant as to his election not to testify.
 5
               THE COURT: Okay. That's probably a good point.
 6
                             That should be done outside of the
               MR. DePORRE:
 7
     presence of the jury, before I call the rebuttal witnesses.
 8
               THE COURT: We will do that. We'll take a very
 9
     short break at that point.
10
               MR. DePORRE: Thank you, Your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: That makes sense to me. Okay.
                                                           Then I
12
     probably won't take a break between my instructions and your
13
     closings. Does that work for you?
14
               MR. DePORRE: That's fine.
15
               THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet.
16
               MR. LONGSTREET: I'm ready.
17
               MR. DePORRE: Will you print two extra copies of
18
     the instructions for the parties?
19
               THE COURT:
                          Yes. I have them printing 20, so there
20
     should be plenty for everybody. They'll be one for you guys,
21
     and then for you, Mr. Longstreet, and Mr. Garza, too.
22
               MR. DePORRE: Yesterday there was some discussion
23
     about us asking --
24
               THE CASE MANAGER: All rise for the jury.
25
               THE COURT: We'll take that up in a minute.
```

(Jury entered at 9:56 a.m.)

THE COURT: Please be seated. Ladies and gentlemen, let me start with an apology for the late start, but I want to couple that apology with the good news. While you guys have been in there for waiting for us, we have been working hard to figure out the most efficient way to present the case to you, and we made substantial progress, and right now we are on target to get the case to you guys by lunchtime, so we made a lot of progress while you guys were in there. I don't want you to think we were out here, you know, practicing our golf swing. We were actually doing work, and the work that we were doing will inure to your benefit. So thank you for your patience, but I do want to apologize that you guys were sitting in there.

And this is the opportunity for Mr. Longstreet to call any witnesses on behalf of Mr. Garza, if he wishes to do so. Mr. Longstreet, would you like to call any witnesses?

MR. LONGSTREET: Yes. The defense would call two witnesses in the matter, and the first will be Mr. Blake Austin Parkes.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Parkes, do you mind coming up here and standing right in front of the bench just for one moment, sir.

Would you raise your right hand.

Do you swear that the testimony you will provide

```
will be truth?
 1
 2
               MR. PARKES: Yes.
 3
                           Thank you. Mr. Parkes, will you settle
               THE COURT:
     into the witness chair over here. And as you are settling
 4
 5
     in, let me ask you to please keep your voice up and speak
     slowly, so we can hear everything you have to say.
 6
 7
               MR. PARKES: Yes, Your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you.
 9
                            BLAKE A. PARKES,
10
     called at about 9:57 a.m., was examined and testified on his
11
     oath as follows:
12
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
13
     BY MR. LONGSTREET:
14
        Good morning, sir.
     0.
15
        Good morning.
     Α.
16
          Can you please state your name for the record?
17
     A. Blake Parkes.
18
         Mr. Parkes, I would like to direct your attention to the
     Ο.
19
     day of November 2nd, 2022. Do you recall that day?
20
          That, to the best of my knowledge, yeah, I've been
     Α.
21
     trying to remember it for a few days now, yes.
22
          Thank you. And on that day, were you approached by two
     Q.
23
     federal agents?
24
     A. Yes, sir.
25
          Okay. And when you made contact with these federal
```

- 1 agents, you had discussion in reference to a 2008 white
- 3 A. Yes, I did.
- $4 \parallel Q$. And at some point, did you own that 2008 white
- 5 Grand Prix.
- 6 **■** A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Okay. And when you owned this 2008 white Grand Prix, at
- 8 some point did you sell the vehicle?
- 9 A. Yes, I did.
- 10 Q. Okay. And do you -- and when these agents came to see
- 11 you, did they provide you photographs of persons that you may
- 12 have sold the car to?
- 13 A. Yes, they showed me three pictures.
- 14 Q. Okay. Thank you. I'd like to show you what is going to
- 15 be marked as Defendant's Proposed Exhibit B for
- 16 identification purposes only.
- 17 | (Defendant's Exhibit B marked for identification
- 18 purposes.)
- 19 BY MR. LONGSTREET:
- 20 Q. Sir, do you recognize the photograph on the screen?
- 21 A. Yes, I do.
- 22 Q. Okay. And is this the person you identified as the
- 23 person who purchased your vehicle?
- 24 A. Yes, it is.
- 25 Q. Does that fairly and accurately depict the photograph

- that you were shown of the person that, possibly, you sold 2 this vehicle to? 3 I believe it is the same photo, yes. 4 MR. LONGSTREET: Thank you. The defense moves for 5 Exhibit B to be entered into evidence as Defendant's B. 6 Any objection? THE COURT: 7 MR. DePORRE: No, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Okay. That's admitted. 9 (Defendant's Exhibit B received into evidence.) 10 MR. LONGSTREET: Thank you. 11 BY MR. LONGSTREET: 12 I want to direct your attention -- well, do you recall 13 when you sold this vehicle? 14 A. From the research I did, going back in my phone, I 15 believe it was in November of 2019. 16 Q. At a certain point, were you called by the police to
- 17 pick up this vehicle? 18 A. I received a letter from a police department. I tried
- 19 to do research on that as well, I don't know what department,
- 20 but I did receive a letter stating that the vehicle was
- 21 impounded in Owosso, and I did go down there to try to find
- out what happened and why the car was there, but the bill was
- 23 so high on the vehicle, it was close to what I had sold the
- 24 car for, so I just left it there.

25 Do you recall whether that was in November or December

```
1 of 2020?
```

- $2 \parallel A$. It was at least two months after I had sold the car.
- 3 MR. LONGSTREET: Thank you. Nothing further.
- 4 THE COURT: Mr. DePorre, any questions?
- 5 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 6 BY MR. DePORRE:
- 7 Q. You said you looked back in your phone, and you believe 8 you sold the car in November of 2019?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 \blacksquare Q. And then you said it was Owosso that you got a call from
- 11 where the car was impounded?
- 12 A. I received a letter from a police department, but I
- 13 don't believe it was Owosso. I just know that the car got
- 14 impounded in Owosso -- it was a couple miles of where it was
- 15 left in a farmer's field.
- 16 Q. Now, where you are you from?
- 17 A. I'm in Linden.
- 18 Q. Do you know where Mundy Township is?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
- 20 Q. Are you sure it wasn't Mundy Township?
- 21 A. As far as the police department that contacted me?
- 22 Q. No. Where the impound lot was.
- 23 A. No, absolutely not. It was -- it was on Corunna Road,
- 24 in Owosso. It's a tow yard that's no longer in business,
- 25 they are closed now. I tried contacting that tow yard for

- $1 \mid \mid$ information and I found out they were out of business.
- $2 \parallel Q$. And that you think was also back in 2019?
- $3 \parallel A$. I think that was in the early part of 2020 when I found
- 4 out the car was impounded.
- $5 \parallel Q$. All right. And you said that you sold the car. How
- 6 much did you sell it for?
- 7 A. I believe it was \$900.
- 8 Q. And how much did that impound lot want for it?
- 9 A. It was close to that, 700, 800, I think, to get the car
- 10 back.
- 11 \square Q. And it wasn't worth that to you?
- 12 A. No. The car wasn't running, and it had some damage to
- 13 | it that it didn't have when I sold it, that's why I left it
- 14 there.
- 15 Q. Do you buy and sell cars?
- 16 \blacksquare A. Sometimes, like a little side thing.
- 17 Q. Are you pretty good of deciding on what the value of the
- *18* **∥** car is?
- 19 A. I believe so, yeah.
- 20 Q. All right. So for you, it wasn't worth 700 bucks?
- 21 A. No.
- 22 Q. All right. After January of 2020, you don't know what
- 23 happened to that car, do you?
- $24 \parallel A$. No clue.
- 25 Q. You have no idea if somebody else paid 700 bucks to get

- $1 \parallel \text{ it out of impound?}$
- $2 \mid A$. No, I do not know.
- 3 Q. You don't know if somebody traded it for something else?
- $4 \parallel$ A. Well, I did some research on that, too, and from what I
- 5 found out, that you have 30 days once you get that letter,
- 6 and then the tow yard can either sell the car or auction it
- 7 or scrap it. I don't know what they did with it after that.
- 8 Q. I want to show you an exhibit --
- 9 MR. DePORRE: Actually, you have to do it. This is
- 10 Government's Exhibit 5F. We would like to approach.
- 11 THE COURT: Go ahead.
- 12 BY MR. DePORRE:
- 13 Q. Do you recognize Government's Exhibit 5F?
- 14 A. No, sir.
- 15 Q. That's not your gun?
- 16 \blacksquare A. No, sir. I've never owned a pistol.
- 17 Q. And you have never left a gun inside a Grand Prix that
- 18 you later -- a Pontiac Grand Prix that you sold?
- 19 A. Positive, no, I've never left a gun in any vehicle.
- 20 Q. All right. Do you have any control over the person that
- 21 buys the car from you -- you can actually head back with the
- 22 gun. Thank you, Mr. Orvis.
- Do you have any control over whether or not the
- 24 next person that buys the car from you or the person after
- 25 that or the person after that, if any have them register the

- 1 \blacksquare car, do you have any way to know that?
- $2 \parallel A$. Aside from going physically to the Secretary of State
- 3 with them, no. But what I generally do when I sell a vehicle
- 4 is take -- I make the person buying the car sign off on it
- 5 and I take a photo of that title. I really tried my hardest
- 6 to find that for the two agents that stopped by my house, but
- 7 for some reason I believe it was an old phone and I don't
- 8 have that information for this car.
- 9 Q. But you have some information that shows you sold it
- 10 back in 2019?
- 11 A. Yeah, just -- I have the Facebook conversation from the
- 12 person that met me at the gas station, because I know I sold
- 13 the car at Meijer gas station, in Flint, and -- but whoever
- 14 | had that Facebook profile and the person I was contacting
- 15 deleted it, and it deleted all of our conversation and any
- 16 information there.
- 17 Q. You said you are from Linden. Did you sell it at the
- 18 Meijer on Hill Road?
- 19 A. No, it was on Center Road, in Flint.
- 20 Q. The Burton Meijer?
- 21 A. Correct.
- 22 Q. All right. And you said you sold it to the person that
- 23 was up on the screen.
- $24 \parallel A$. There were two people there that night, but I believe it
- 25 was the person on the screen that actually paid me and drove

- $1 \parallel$ off with the vehicle.
- $2 \parallel Q$. Was the other person a woman?
- 3 A. No, it was a black male.
- $4 \parallel Q$. And did that guy on the screen, did he have all the
- 5 money to buy the car --
- 6 A. No, he did not.
- $7 \mid Q$. -- at first?
- 8 A. No. He was borrowing money from the person that was
- 9 with him. I do remember that it took him quite a long time,
- 10 they were counting up small bills to make up the amount that
- 11 they needed.
- 12 Q. All right. When you sold the car, was the
- 13 battery -- was the battery mounted, was it affixed, or do you
- 14 have any idea whether or not it was loose in the car or was
- 15 | it bracketed in?
- 16 A. I believe it was mounted correctly. I didn't do -- I
- 17 mean, this vehicle, I didn't own for a long period of time.
- 18 \parallel I bought the car at auction, and I mainly detailed it and put
- 19 tires on it and sold the vehicle.
- 20 Q. All right. And you have no idea what happened to it
- 21 after you sold it?
- 22 A. No, sir.
- 23 MR. DePORRE: Nothing further.
- 24 THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet.
- 25 MR. LONGSTREET: Nothing, thank you.

```
THE COURT:
                           Thank you, Mr. Parkes. I appreciate
 2
     your time.
 3
     Α.
          Thank you.
 4
               (Witness excused at 10:07 a.m.)
 5
               THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet, do you have any other
     witnesses you wish to call?
 6
 7
               MR. LONGSTREET: Defense would call
 8
     Agent Louis Valega.
 9
               THE COURT: Sir, would you come forward and raise
10
     your right hand?
11
               Do you swear that the testimony you are about to
12
     give will be the truth?
13
               OFFICER VALEGA: Yes, sir, I do.
14
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you. Welcome. Would you please
15
     make yourself comfortable in the witness chair, and could I
16
     ask you to please speak slowly and keep your voice up.
17
               OFFICER VALEGA: Yes, sir.
18
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you.
19
                         OFFICER LOUIS VALEGA,
20
     called at about 10:08 a.m., was examined and testified on his
21
     oath as follows:
22
                           DIRECT EXAMINATION
23
     BY MR. LONGSTREET:
24
        Good morning, sir.
     Q.
          Good morning.
```

- $1 \quad \square$ Q. Please state your name and occupation for the record.
- 2 A. My name is Louis Valega. I'm employed with the Michigan
- 3 State Police.
- $4 \parallel Q$. Sir, were you so employed on November 2nd, 2022?
- $5 \parallel A$. Yes, sir, I was.
- $6 \parallel Q$. And part of your duties with the Michigan State Police,
- 7 did you happen to come in contact, on that day, with a person
- 8 by the name of Blake Austin Parkes?
- 9 A. Yes, I did.
- 10 Q. And, sir, did you make contact with Blake Austin Parkes
- 11 as a part of an investigation in the case of the
- 12 United States v. Noe Garza?
- 13 A. Yes, sir, I did.
- 14 \blacksquare Q. And, sir, did you go to this particular location for a
- 15 specified reason?
- 16 A. Yes, sir, I did.
- 17 \blacksquare Q. And what was that reason?
- 18 A. Mr. Parkes was the registered owner in LEIN, which is
- 19 the Law Enforcement Information Network, for the 2008 white
- 20 Pontiac Grand Prix.
- 21 Q. And he was the registered owner in LEIN on this
- 22 particular vehicle, November 2nd of 2022, correct?
- 23 A. Yes, sir.
- 24 Q. Thank you. And, sir, as a part of your investigation
- 25 into the United States v. Noe Garza, did you present to

```
Mr. Parkes three photographs?
 2
     Α.
          Yes, sir, I did.
 3
          And in those three photographs -- I would like to show
     you what has been admitted as Defendant's B. Do you
 4
 5
     recognize the photograph that is depicted on the screen?
 6
     Α.
          Yes, I do.
 7
          And, sir, could you identify who this person is in this
     Q.
 8
     photograph?
 9
     Α.
          That is Meldrum Allen.
10
          Thank you. And is Meldrum Allen also a part of the
11
     investigation into United States v. Noe Garza?
12
          He is related, yes.
     Α.
13
          Thank you. And you are aware he was arrested with
     Q.
14
     Mr. Garza on November 26th, 2020?
15
          Yes, sir.
     Α.
16
          Sir, as part of your investigation into this 2008 white
17
     Grand Prix, did you receive information that the vehicle was
18
     possibly sold in 2020?
19
               MR. DePORRE: Objection, Your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: What's the basis of the objection?
21
               MR. DePORRE: Hearsay.
22
               THE COURT: Let me see you guys at sidebar for a
23
     second.
              Can you take that down while we are --
24
               (Sidebar conference held on the record
```

at 10:11 a.m. as follows:

25

```
What is this? You want to ask him what
               THE COURT:
 2
     a witness told him it was sold in 2020.
 3
               MR. LONGSTREET: Whether he received information or
     whether he learned that the vehicle was sold in 2020. It's
 4
 5
     in his report.
 6
               THE COURT:
                           Isn't that hearsay?
 7
               MR. LONGSTREET: It doesn't go to the truth of the
 8
     matter asserted. It goes to the extent of his investigation.
 9
               THE COURT:
                          It seems to me that it goes to the
10
     truth of the matter asserted.
11
               MR. LONGSTREET: That the vehicle was purchased
12
     in 2020 versus 2019?
13
               THE COURT: You want to establish the fact that it
14
     was sold in 2020.
15
                                That's correct.
               MR. LONGSTREET:
16
               THE COURT: So it seems to me, this is being
17
     offered for the truth of that assertion.
18
               MR. LONGSTREET: Let me see if I can get around
19
     that.
20
               THE COURT: Do you want to try here, before in
21
     front of the jury?
22
               MR. LONGSTREET: Sure.
23
               THE COURT: Who do you believe told him it was sold
24
     in 2020?
25
               MR. LONGSTREET: Mr. Parkes.
```

```
Why didn't you ask Parkes that?
               THE COURT:
 2
     had the live witness right there.
 3
               MR. LONGSTREET: I did, who testified it was
     in 2019. I guess I should have refreshed his recollection as
 4
 5
     to -- well, there would be no reason to refresh his
 6
     recollection, because he didn't say his memory needed to be
 7
     refresh. He just said he remembered based on the information
 8
     that he looked at, that it was in 2019.
 9
               THE COURT: My view is, I don't -- first of all, I
10
     think it is hearsay and, second of all, I think that Parkes
11
     is -- if the source of this information is Parkes?
12
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                Yes.
13
               THE COURT: He would have been the right person to
14
     ask, and to the extent that this guy is offering a different
15
     version from Parkes, he's impeaching the other witness. So
16
     mainly, I think it's hearsay and I'm going to sustain the
17
     objection.
18
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                               Okav.
19
               THE COURT: Okay.
20
               (Sidebar conference concluded at 10:13 a.m.)
21
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
22
               MR. LONGSTREET: Nothing further of this witness.
     Thank you.
23
24
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you.
25
               Mr. DePorre, any questions?
```

1	MR. DePORRE: Thank you, Your Honor.
2	CROSS-EXAMINATION
3	BY MR. DePORRE:
4	Q. Trooper Valega, good morning.
5	A. Good morning, sir.
6	Q. I just have one question for you. What is
7	Meldrum Allen's middle name?
8	A. Reginald, to my knowledge.
9	Q. Do you know if he uses the nickname Reggie?
10	A. I have heard him I have heard Reggie Allen as a
11	nickname for him, yes.
12	MR. DePORRE: I have nothing further.
13	THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet.
14	MR. LONGSTREET: Nothing. Thank you.
15	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Valega.
16	(Witness excused at 10:14 a.m.)
17	THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet, any other witnesses?
18	MR. LONGSTREET: At this time the defense closes
19	its case in chief.
20	THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, for
21	procedural reasons, we are going to take a very short break
22	here, and I do mean very short, and then we will bring you
23	right back and we will keep moving. Thank you for your
24	cooperation.
25	THE CASE MANAGER: All rise for the jury.
I	

```
1
               (Jury excused at 10:14 a.m.)
 2
               THE COURT: Please be seated.
 3
               Mr. Garza, can you scoot to the microphone? You
 4
     can stay seated; do you mind taking off your mask? I want to
 5
     chat with you for a moment.
 6
                               Yes, sir.
               THE DEFENDANT:
 7
               THE COURT: Mr. Garza, do you understand that in
 8
     this trial, you have an absolute right to testify in your own
 9
     defense, if you wish to do so? Do you understand that sir?
10
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: And have you had a sufficient
12
     opportunity to talk to Mr. Longstreet and to consider his
13
     advice about whether you should testify in your own defense
14
     here?
15
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               I have, Your Honor.
16
               THE COURT: Has he answered all of your questions
17
     on that issue?
18
               THE DEFENDANT: He has.
19
               THE COURT: Have you had enough time to think about
20
     that issue?
21
               THE DEFENDANT: I have, Your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: And based on your own thoughts on the
23
     matter and your discussions with Mr. Longstreet, have you
24
     decided whether you wish to testify in your own defense here?
25
               THE DEFENDANT: I have decided.
```

1	THE COURT: What is your decision?
2	THE DEFENDANT: I'm not going to testify.
3	THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. DePorre, any other
4	questions that you wish me to ask of Mr. Garza?
5	MR. DePORRE: No, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet, any questions that you
7	want to ask, to make a fuller record in that regard?
8	MR. LONGSTREET: No.
9	THE COURT: Okay. All right. So it seems to me,
10	is the next step, Mr. DePorre, your rebuttal case?
11	MR. DePORRE: It is, Your Honor.
12	THE COURT: And remind me what this is, it is a
13	pretty short case?
14	MR. DePORRE: It is. It is basically playing
15	excerpted clips of the interview between Steven Fisher and
16	Mr. Garza, and I will be presenting that testimony through
17	the case agent.
18	THE COURT: All right. These are different clips
19	than we heard in the case in chief?
20	MR. DePORRE: Yes, Your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Okay.
22	MR. DePORRE: At this point, Your Honor, it has
23	come to my attention Mr. Parkes is still in the courtroom,
24	and I just want him to know he's free to go.
25	MR. LONGSTREET: Yes.

```
1
               THE COURT: Mr. Parkes, I'm sorry.
 2
               MR. DePORRE: He's welcome to stay.
 3
                           Thank you for coming, Mr. Parkes, I
               THE COURT:
 4
     appreciate it. I thought he was interested in hearing what I
 5
     had to say.
 6
               MR. DePORRE: If he stayed during jury
 7
     instructions, he's truly interested.
 8
               THE COURT: My plan will be to bring them back in
 9
     and hear the government's rebuttal case, which seems like it
10
     is going to be pretty short, and then I will give them my
11
     instructions and we will go right into closing arguments.
                                                                 Is
12
     that good for you, Mr. DePorre?
13
               MR. DePORRE: Very good.
14
                          Mr. Longstreet.
               THE COURT:
15
                                Yes. However, I do need to, I
               MR. LONGSTREET:
     believe, procedurally, renew my Rule 29 motion.
16
17
               THE COURT: Is now the time to do it?
18
               MR. LONGSTREET: I thought it would have to be
19
     after the closing of the prosecution's case in chief, and
20
     then again at closing of the defense's case in chief.
21
               MR. DePORRE: I actually think it is at the close
22
     of my case in chief and then at the end of trial, after
23
     there's a verdict.
24
               THE COURT: Yeah. Just in case it needed to be
25
     done now, I will treat this as you renewing it and I will
```

```
continue to reserve it. But I think Mr. DePorre is correct,
 2
     I think that the -- I think you've raised it at the
 3
     appropriate time at the end of the government's case, and I
 4
     think it can be made again, or renewed, I'm just looking at
 5
     the rule, within 14 days after the verdict.
 6
               MR. LONGSTREET: Okay. I thought it was actually
 7
     twice during trial.
 8
               THE COURT: But I think you are covered.
 9
               MR. LONGSTREET: Very good. Thank you.
10
               THE COURT: All right. Holly, let's bring them
11
     back.
12
               THE CASE MANAGER: All rise for the jury.
13
               (Jury entered at 10:18 a.m.)
               THE COURT: Please be seated. Welcome back.
14
15
               Mr. DePorre, does the government wish to present
16
     any rebuttal case?
17
               MR. DePORRE: It does, Your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: Please proceed.
19
               MR. DePORRE: Thank you, Your Honor.
20
     government calls Detective Brett Orvis.
21
               THE COURT: I'll swear you in, again, just in case.
22
               Do you swear that the testimony you are about to
23
     give will be the truth?
24
               OFFICER ORVIS: I do.
25
               THE COURT: Thank you. Please join us. You have
```

heard me say several times, please speak up and speak slowly, 1 2 so please do that. 3 OFFICER ORVIS: Yes, sir. 4 OFFICER BRETT ORVIS, 5 called at about 10:19 a.m., was examined and testified on his 6 oath as follows: 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 BY MR. DePORRE: 9 I will make you respell your last name in case. Q. 10 I'm Sergeant Brett Orvis, O-R-V-I-S. 11 Remind us about your involvement in this case? 12 So I am a task force officer with the Federal Yes. 13 Bureau of Investigation, in Flint. I was responsible for 14 coordinating and prosecuting this case. 15 And you weren't involved in the initial investigation, 16 were you? 17 No, I was not. Α. 18 Did you receive some of the evidence that was gathered? Ο. 19 Α. I did. 20 And did you receive a recording of an interview between Q. 21 the defendant and the officer that initially conducted the 22 investigation, Steve Fisher? 23 Α. Yes, I did. 24 Did you review that video?

25

Α.

I have.

- $1 \parallel Q$. And have you done it more than once?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. All right. And have you -- can you identify the people
- 4 speaking?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. All right. I would ask you to take a look at -- would
- 7 you pull up Government's Exhibit 15A. Don't play it just
- 8 yet.
- 9 Now, in the video, at some point did Mr. Garza talk
- 10 about picking up other people or driving other people to
- 11 Meijer?
- 12 A. He does.
- 13 \blacksquare Q. And who does he drive -- who does he say -- excuse
- 14 \parallel me -- who does he say that he drives to Meijer?
- 15 \blacksquare A. He makes reference to Reggie, to giving him a ride -- or
- 16 \parallel that he wanted a ride to Meijer.
- 17 Q. And then was there somebody else that he references that
- 18 was with Reggie?
- 19 A. Yes, Mr. Hutchins.
- 20 Q. All right. I would like to now ask you to listen to
- 21 Government's Exhibit 15A.
- 22 (Video played for the jury.)
- 23 BY MR. DePORRE:
- 24 Q. All right. Who asked Garza to take them to Meijer?
- 25 A. Reggie asked for a ride to Meijer.

- \mathcal{I} Q. And did Garza say that he asked Reggie to take him to
- 2 Meijer?
- $3 \mid A$. No, he did not.
- $4 \parallel Q$. And did Garza say that his clothes -- all of his clothes
- 5 were in the car?
- 6 A. Yes. He makes reference to all of his clothes being in
- 7 his vehicle.
- 8 Q. All right. Now I'd like to you play Government's
- 9 Exhibit 15 B -- actually don't play it yet. Sorry. I jumped
- 10 \parallel the gun.
- 11 At some point during the interview that you
- 12 reviewed, does Mr. Garza talk about a vest?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 \square Q. And what is that vest that he's referencing?
- 15 A. It is a weight vest. Originally, it was believed to be
- 16 a ballistics vest, but it was later determined to be a weight
- 17 vest.
- 18 Q. All right. And during the course of him discussing
- 19 that, does he refer to the car -- the white Pontiac Grand
- 20 | Prix?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 | Q. And what does he call that?
- 23 A. He calls it my car.
- 24 Q. I would now like to play Government's Exhibit 15B.
- 25 (Audio played for the jury.)

```
BY MR. DePORRE:
 2
          Did you hear him also reference the title?
 3
          Yeah, he said the title was in the car.
          And did he -- what pronoun did he use to reference the
 4
 5
     title? How did he refer to the title?
 6
     Α.
          My car.
 7
     Q.
          All right. Would you just play, like, the last four
 8
     seconds of 15B -- five seconds?
 9
               (Audio played for the jury.)
10
     BY MR. DePORRE:
11
     Q. All right. Would you next play Government's
12
     Exhibit 15C? During the call, did he talk about the vest
13
     being in his car for an extended period of time?
14
     Α.
          Yes.
15
         All right. Would you play 15C?
     Q.
16
               (Video played for the jury.)
17
               THE COURT: You said in your question during the
18
            Did you mean during the interview?
     call.
19
               MR. DePORRE: I did.
                                     Thank you for the
20
     clarification.
21
                          Okay.
               THE COURT:
22
     BY MR. DePORRE:
23
        Now, at some point during the interview, we heard that
24
     Officer Fisher asked Mr. Garza, whose gun did I find? Did
     Mr. Garza reference the vehicle during his answer to that
25
```

```
question?
 2
     Α.
          Yes.
 3
     Q. All right. Would you play Government's Exhibit 15D?
 4
               (Video played for the jury.)
 5
     BY MR. DePORRE:
 6
          Did you hear, "They didn't have no guns on them when
 7
     they got in my car"?
 8
          Yes, that's exactly what he said, yes.
 9
          During the interview, did he also talk about processing
     Q.
10
     a marijuana substance called keif?
11
     Α.
          Yes.
12
          What did he say he used to process that?
13
               MR. LONGSTREET: I'm going to object to the
14
     relevance.
15
               MR. DePORRE: I can --
16
               THE COURT:
                          Response.
17
               MR. DePORRE: The firearm in this case was found in
18
     a mesh bag, and the defendant used a mesh bag to process
19
     keif, so that's the relevance.
20
               THE COURT: Okay. Overruled.
21
               Go ahead.
22
               MR. DePORRE: Would you play Government's
23
     Exhibit 15E?
24
               (Video played for the jury.)
25
               MR. DePORRE: All right. I have no further
```

```
1
     questions.
 2
               THE COURT:
                           Mr. Longstreet.
 3
                            CROSS-EXAMINATION
 4
     BY MR. LONGSTREET:
 5
          Sir, we have seen multiple pictures of this mesh bag,
 6
     correct?
 7
          Yes.
     Α.
 8
          And there's no marijuana residue or anything that
 9
     suggests that Mr. Garza used that bag to make keif, correct?
10
     Α.
          No.
11
          Thank you. Now, this weight vest we keep talking about,
     Q.
12
     it's a weight vest to develop core strength, right?
13
          I'm not sure what it was being used for.
     Α.
14
          But it is a weighted vest?
     Q.
15
          It is a weighted vest.
     Α.
16
          And it is for fitness, right?
     Q.
17
          That could be.
     Α.
18
          But most certainly, it is not a bulletproof vest?
     Q.
19
          It is not a ballistics vest.
     Α.
20
          And it is not going to stop any bullets?
     Q.
21
     Α.
          No.
22
          Okay.
                 Secondly, we talked about the video with comment,
     Q.
23
     the title was in the car, correct?
24
     Α.
          Yes.
25
          And you are aware that, based on your review of this
```

```
case, that in order for somebody to get the car back, they
 2
     would have had to have the title, right?
 3
          A signed title, yes.
     Α.
 4
          So tell me, if he was talking about this particular car,
 5
     how could they get the car back if the title was inside the
     car when he got arrested?
 6
 7
          I'm not aware of the details of that.
     Α.
 8
     0.
          Right.
 9
               THE COURT:
                           Anything else?
10
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                              Nothing.
                                          Thank you.
11
               THE COURT: Mr. DePorre.
12
               MR. DePORRE: No rebuttal, Your Honor.
13
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
14
               (Witness excused at 10:29 a.m.)
15
                           Is that the close of the government's
               THE COURT:
16
     rebuttal case?
17
                             It is.
               MR. DePORRE:
18
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. Ladies and
19
     gentlemen, what we are going to do now is move into jury
20
     instructions and closing arguments, so I'm going do my magic
21
     trick; I'm going to ask Holly to come out. We are going to
22
     pass out to you guys -- everybody's going to get two
23
     documents, one is going to be a set of the jury instructions,
24
     so you can read along with me, and everybody is also going to
     get a copy of the verdict form.
```

```
So, Holly, can you share these with the jurors and
 2
     then a couple to each counsel table, please.
 3
               MR. DePORRE: Judge, while these are being
     distributed, could we have a brief sidebar?
 4
 5
               THE COURT:
                           Sure.
               (Sidebar conference held on the record
 6
 7
               at 10:30 a.m. as follows:
 8
               MR. DePORRE: Before the jury came out, I raised an
 9
     issue about an additional instruction, and I wrote myself a
10
     sticky note. It was on the issue of marijuana. You asked me
11
     to include that in my remarks about the argument that he's
12
     not charged with any marijuana offenses. I thinks that's
13
     sufficiently -- I intend to include that in closing, as well.
14
     I think it has been sufficiently addressed, but I had
15
     suggested earlier, possibly the Court providing a limiting
16
     instruction.
17
                           I will say, at the end of the written
               THE COURT:
18
     instruction that I have here, I will orally advise them, even
19
     though it is not on the papers, that this case is not about
20
     marijuana, and he's not charged with marijuana.
21
               MR. DePORRE: Thank you.
22
               THE COURT:
                           Is that okay, Mr. Longstreet?
23
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                Yes.
24
               THE COURT: Okay.
25
               (Sidebar conference concluded at 10:31 a.m.)
```

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, the instructions have been given to you so you can read along with me and help you follow. What I'm going to do now is give you the instructions up to instruction number 22. When I finish 22, I'm going to turn it over to the lawyers to give their closing arguments, and when they are done, I will give you the final instructions. Please listen very carefully.

Members of the jury, now it is time for me to instruct you about the law that you must follow in deciding this case. I will start by explaining your duties and the general rules that apply in every criminal case. Then I will explain some rules that you must follow in evaluating particular testimony and evidence. Then I will explain the elements or parts of the crimes that the defendant is accused of committing. And last, I will explain the rules that you must follow during your deliberations in the jury room, and the possible verdicts that you may return. Please listen very carefully to everything that I say.

You have two main duties as jurors. The first one is to decide what the facts are, from the evidence that you saw and heard here in court. Deciding what the facts are is your job, and not mine, and nothing that I have said or done during this trial was meant to influence your decision about the facts in any way.

Your second duty is to take the law that I give

you should consider them together, as a whole.

you, apply it to the facts, and decide if the government has proved that the -- proved the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. It is my job to instruct you about the law, and you are bound by the oath that you took at the beginning of the trial, to follow the instructions that I give you, even if you personally disagree with them.

This includes the instructions that I gave you before and during the trial, and these instructions that I am now providing. All of the instructions are important, and

The lawyers may talk about the law during their arguments, but if what they say is different from what I say, you must follow what I say. What I say about the law controls. Perform these duties fairly. Do not let any bias, sympathy or prejudice that you may feel toward one side or the other influence your decision in any way.

As you know, the defendant has pleaded not guilty to the crimes charged in the indictment. The indictment is not any evidence, at all, of guilt, it is just the formal way that the government tells the defendant what crimes he's accused of committing. It does not even raise any suspicion of guilt.

Instead, the defendant starts the trial with a clean slate, with no evidence, at all, against him, and the law presumes that he is innocent. This presumption of

innocence stays with him, unless the government presents evidence here in court that overcomes the presumption and convinces you, beyond a reasonable doubt, that he is guilty. This means that the defendant has no obligation to present any evidence at all, or to prove to you, in any way, that he is innocent. It is up to the government to prove that he is guilty, and this burden stays on the government from start to finish. You must find the defendant not guilty, unless the government convinces you, beyond a reasonable doubt, that he is guilty.

The government must prove every element of the crimes charged, beyond a reasonable doubt. Proof beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond all possible doubt. Possible doubts or doubts based purely on speculation are not reasonable doubts. A reasonable doubt is a doubt based on reason and common sense. It may arise from the evidence, the lack of evidence, or the nature of the evidence.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt means proof which is so convincing that you would not hesitate to rely and act on it in making the most important decisions in your own lives. If you are convinced that the government has proved the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, say so by returning a guilty verdict. If you are not convinced, say so by returning a not guilty verdict.

You must make your decision based only on the evidence that you saw and heard here in court. Do not let rumors, suspicions or anything else that you may have seen or heard outside of court influence your decision in any way.

The evidence in this case includes only what the witness said while they were testifying under oath, the exhibits that I allowed into evidence, and the stipulations that the lawyers agreed to. Nothing else is evidence.

Lawyers' statements and arguments are not evidence. Their questions and objections are not evidence. My legal rulings are not evidence, and my comments and questions are not evidence.

During the trial, I did not let you hear the answers to some of the questions that the lawyers asked, and sometimes I ordered you to disregard things that you saw or heard, or I struck things from the record. You must completely ignore all of these things. Do not even think about them. Do not speculate about what a witness might have said. These things are not evidence, and you are bound by your oath not to let them influence your decision in any way. Make your decision based only on the evidence as I have defined it here, and nothing else.

You are to consider only the evidence in this case. You should use your common sense in weighing the evidence. Consider the evidence in light of your everyday experience

with people and events and give it whatever weight you believe it deserves. If your experience tells you that certain evidence reasonably leads to a conclusion, you are free to reach that conclusion.

In our lives, we often look at one fact and conclude from it that another fact exists. In law, we call this an inference. A jury is allowed to make reasonable inferences, unless otherwise instructed. Any inferences you make must be reasonable and must be based on the evidence in the case. The existence of an inference does not change or shift the burden of proof from the government to the defendant.

Now, some of you may have heard the terms, direct evidence and circumstantial evidence. Direct evidence is simply evidence like the testimony of an eyewitness, which, if you believe it, directly proves a fact. If a witness testified that he saw it raining outside and you believed him, that would be direct evidence that it was raining.

Circumstantial evidence is simply a chain of circumstances that indirectly proves a fact. If somebody walked into the courtroom wearing a raincoat covered with drops of water, and carrying a wet umbrella, that would be circumstantial evidence from which you could conclude that it was raining.

It is your job to decide how much weight to give

the direct and circumstantial evidence. The law makes no distinction between the weight that you should give to either one, and does not say that one is any better evidence than the other. You should consider all of the evidence, both direct and circumstantial, and give it whatever weight you believe it deserves.

Another part of your job as jurors is to decide how credible or believable each witness was. This is your job, not mine. It's up to you to decide if a witness's testimony was believable and how much weight you think it deserves. You are free to believe everything that a witness said, or any part of it, or none of it at all, but you should act reasonably and carefully in making these decisions.

Let me suggest some things for you to consider in evaluating each witness's testimony. Ask yourself if the witness was able to clearly see or hear the events?

Sometimes even an honest witness may not have been able to see or hear what was happening and may make a mistake. Ask yourself how good the witness's memory seemed to be. Did the witness seem able to accurately remember what happened? Ask yourself if there was anything else that may have interfered with the witness's ability to perceive or remember the events. Ask yourself how the witness acted while testifying. Did the witness appear honest or did the witness appear to be lying? Ask yourself if the witness had any relationship to

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the government or the defendant or anything to gain or lose from the case that might influence the witness's testimony. Ask yourself if the witness had any bias or prejudice or reason for testifying that might cause the witness to sly -to lie or slant the testimony in favor of one side or the other. And ask yourself how believable the witness's testimony was, in light of all of the other evidence. the witness's testimony supported or contradicted by other evidence that you found believable? If you believe that a witness's testimony was contradicted by other evidence, remember that people sometimes forget things, and that even two honest people who witness the same event, may not describe it exactly the same way. These are only some of the things that you may consider in deciding how believable each witness was. You may also consider other things that you think shed some light on the witness's believability. Use your common sense and your everyday experience in dealing with other people, and then decide what testimony you believe and how much weight you think it deserves.

Another point about the witnesses. Sometimes jurors wonder if the number of witnesses who testified makes any difference. Do not make any decisions based only on the number of witnesses who testified. What is more important is how believable the witnesses were and how much weight you

think their testimony deserves. Concentrate on that, not the numbers.

There is one more general subject that I want to talk to you about before I begin explaining the elements of the crimes charged. The lawyers for both sides objected to some of the things that were said or done during the trial. Do not hold that against either side. The lawyers have a duty to object whenever they think that something is not permitted by the Rules of Evidence. Those rules are designed to make sure that both sides receive a fair trial. And do not interpret my rulings on their objection as any indication of how I think the case should be decided. My rulings were based on the Rules of Evidence, not on how I feel about the case. Remember that your decision must be based only on the evidence that you saw and heard here in court.

That concludes the part of my instructions explaining your duties and the general rules that apply in every criminal case. In a moment, I will explain the elements of the crimes that the defendant is accused of committing, but before I do that, I want to emphasize that the defendant is only on trial for the particular crimes charged in the indictment. Your job is limited to deciding whether the government has proved the crimes charged.

The defendant has been charged with several crimes. The number of charges is no evidence of guilt, and this

should not influence your decision in any way. It is your duty to separately consider the evidence that relates to each charge and to return a separate verdict for each one.

For each charge, you must decide whether the government has presented proof, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant is guilty of that particular charge. Your decision on one charge, whether it is guilty or not guilty, should not influence your decision on any of the other charges.

Count 1 charges the defendant with being a prohibited person in possession of a firearm and ammunition. For you to find the defendant guilty of this crime, you must find that the government has proved each and every one of the following elements, beyond a reasonable doubt.

First, that the defendant has been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for more than one year. The government and the defendant have agreed that the defendant has previously been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for more than one year.

Second, that the defendant, following his conviction, knowingly possessed a firearm or the ammunition specified in the indictment.

Third, that at the time the defendant possessed the firearm or ammunition, he knew that he had been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for more than one year.

The government and the defendant have agreed that the defendant knew he had been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for more than one year.

Fourth, that the specified firearm or ammunition crossed a state line prior to the alleged possession. It is sufficient for this element to show that the firearm or the ammunition was manufactured in a state other than Michigan. The government and the defendant have agreed that the firearm and ammunition crossed a state line prior to the alleged possession.

Now, I will give you more detailed instructions on some of these elements. First, the defendant does not have to own the firearm or ammunition in order to possess them.

Next, I want to explain something about possession. The government does not necessarily have to prove that the defendant physically possessed the firearm or ammunition for you to find him guilty of this crime.

The law recognizes two kinds of possession, actual possession and constructive possession. Either one of these, if proved by the government, is enough to convict. To establish actual possession, the government must prove that the defendant had direct physical control over an object or substance, and knew that he had control of it. To establish constructive possession, the government must prove that the defendant had the right to exercise physical control over the

object or substance and knew that he had this right and that he intended to exercise physical control over them at some time either directly or through other persons.

For example, if you left something with a friend, intending to come back later and pick it up, or intending to send somebody else to pick it up for you, you would have constructive possession of it while it was in the actual possession of your friend. But understand that just being present where something is located, does not equal possession. The government must prove that the defendant had constructive possession of the firearm or ammunition and knew that he did, for you to find him guilty of this crime. This, of course, is all for you to decide.

The term, "knowingly," means voluntarily and intentionally and not because of mistake or accident. If you are convinced that the government has proved all of these elements, say so by returning a guilty verdict on this charge. If you have a reasonable doubt about any one of these elements, then you must find the defendant not guilty of this charge.

Count 2 charges the defendant with possession of a firearm with an obliterated serial number, in violation of federal law. For you to find the defendant guilty of this crime, you must be convinced that the government proved each and every one of the following elements beyond a reasonable

doubt. 1 2 First, that the defendant knowingly possessed a 3 firearm. And, again, the term, "knowingly," means voluntarily and intentionally, and not because of mistake or 4 5 accident. 6 Second, that the firearm had moved from one state 7 to another. The government and the defendant have agreed 8 that the firearm moved from one state to another. 9 Third, that the manufacturer's serial number of the 10 firearm had been removed, obliterated or altered. 11 Fourth, that the defendant knew that the serial 12 number had been removed, obliterated, or altered. 13 If you are convinced that the government has proved 14 all of these elements, say so by returning a quilty verdict 15 on this charge. If you have a reasonable doubt about any one 16 of these elements, then you must find the defendant not 17 quilty of this charge. 18 Count 3 charges the defendant with the crime of 19 possession with intent to distribute buprenorphine. Don't 20 hang on my pronunciation of this word. Give it to me one 21 more time, Mr. DePorre. 22 MR. DePORRE: Buprenorphine. 23 THE COURT: Buprenorphine. Buprenorphine is a

controlled substance. For you to find the defendant quilty

of this crime, you must find that the government has proved

24

25

each and every one of the following elements, beyond a reasonable doubt.

First, that the defendant knowingly possessed buprenorphine.

Second, that the defendant intended to distribute buprenorphine.

Now I will give you more detailed instructions on some of these terms. We have already discussed the meaning of actual and constructive possession. Those same instructions and definitions apply to this Count 3. Remember that just being present where something is located does not equal possession. The government must prove that the defendant had possession of buprenorphine, and knew that he did, for you to find him guilty of this crime. This, of course, is all for you to decide.

To prove that the defendant knowingly possessed buprenorphine, the defendant did not have to know that the substance was buprenorphine. It is enough that the defendant knew that it was some kind of controlled substance. Further, the defendant did not have to know how much buprenorphine he possessed. It is enough that the defendant knew he possessed some quantity of buprenorphine.

The phrase, "intended to distribute," means the defendant intended to deliver or transfer a controlled substance sometime in the future. If you are convinced that

the government has proven all of these elements, say so by returning a guilty verdict on this charge. If you have a reasonable doubt about any one of these elements, then you must find the defendant not guilty of this charge.

I want to say a word about the dates mentioned in the indictment. The indictment charges that the crimes happened on or about November 26th, 2020. The government does not have to prove that the crimes happened on that exact date, but the government must prove that the crimes happened reasonably close to that date.

This concludes the part of my instructions explaining the elements of the crime. Next, I will explain some rules that you must use in considering some of the testimony and evidence.

A defendant has an absolute right not to testify or present evidence. The fact that the defendant did not testify cannot be considered by you in any way. Do not even discuss it your deliberation. Remember that it is up to the government to prove the defendant guilty, beyond a reasonable doubt. It is not up to the defendant to prove that he is innocent.

You have heard the testimony of Dustin Hurt, who testified as an opinion witness. You do not have to accept Dustin Hurt's opinion. In deciding how much weight to give it, you should consider the witness's qualifications and how

he reached his conclusions. Also consider the other factors discussed in these instructions for weighing the credibility of witnesses. Remember that you, alone, decide how much of a witness's testimony to believe, and how much weight it deserves.

You have heard that before this trial, the defendant was convicted of crimes. These early convictions were brought to your attention only as one way -- excuse me. The point I want to make here is that the earlier convictions are not evidence that the defendant, here, is guilty of the crimes for which he's on trial now. Other than that, you can disregard what you have written there on number 19.

During the trial, you may have seen counsel use a timeline which was offered to assist in the presentation and understanding of the evidence of evidence. It is my understanding you may see this in closing argument. The material on the timeline is not, itself, evidence and must not be considered as proof of any facts.

You have heard evidence that the defendant,

Mr. Garza, made statements in which the government claims he
admitted certain facts. It is for you to decide whether the
defendant made the statements and if so, how much weight they
deserve. In making these decisions, you should consider all
of the evidence about the statements, including the
circumstances under which the defendant allegedly made them.

```
You may not convict the defendant solely upon his own
 2
     uncorroborated statement or admission.
 3
               The government and the defendant have agreed or
     stipulated to certain facts, and therefore you must accept
 4
 5
     the following stipulated facts as proved.
 6
               First, that the firearms and ammunition alleged in
 7
     the indictment were manufactured outside of the state of
 8
     Michigan and were moved from one state to another.
 9
               Second, that the defendant knew he had a prior
10
     conviction for a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term
11
     exceeding one year.
12
               And third, that the buprenorphine alleged in the
13
     indictment was, in fact, buprenorphine, a controlled
14
     substance.
15
               I want to make one other point that is not on here.
16
     During the trial, you have heard reference to marijuana and
17
     keif, and I want to make clear to you that Mr. Garza is not
18
     on trial for any marijuana-related offenses or any
19
     keif-related offenses of any kind.
20
               Before we go to closing, let me see counsel at
21
     sidebar for a second.
22
               (Sidebar conference held on the record
23
               at 10:54 a.m. as follows:
24
               THE COURT: So I noticed as I was giving these
25
     instructions, that one in the packet that I missed was this
```

```
reference to him being convicted of certain crimes, and they
 2
     were brought to the jury's attention to help them decide how
 3
     believable his testimony was. I didn't give that instruction
     when I caught it. I said -- I mentioned only the last
 4
 5
     sentence there, that the crimes aren't evidence that he's
 6
     quilty of the crimes he's on trial for now.
 7
               Do either of you think I need to do anything else
 8
     related to this point, Mr. DePorre?
               MR. DePORRE: The government doesn't. We believe
 9
10
     it is clear.
11
               MR. LONGSTREET: Nothing on behalf of the
12
     defendant.
13
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
               (Sidebar conference concluded at 10:55 a.m.)
14
15
               THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, I
16
     have reached the end of the initial portion of my
17
     instructions, and I'm going to turn it over to Mr. DePorre
18
     now for the government's closing argument.
19
               Mr. DePorre.
20
               MR. DePORRE: Thank you, Your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: Go ahead.
22
               MR. DePORRE: Thank you. Good morning.
23
               THE JURY:
                          (Collectively) Good morning.
24
               MR. DePORRE: This is my opportunity to talk about
25
     the law and the facts. And before I get started going down
```

that road and talking about the law or the facts, there's one key piece of evidence that I want to highlight.

Back during opening yesterday, I said that you would hear the defendant's own words. The most compelling evidence in this case is that the defendant told his girlfriend that he could protect her. He told her that he had a banger, that his mom had it in the car, and that the Metro Police didn't find it.

Would you play Government's Exhibit 11B? (Audio played for the jury.)

MR. DePORRE: The only reasonable explanation that he would say this is that he believed it. He believed he had pulled one over on the cops and that he had gotten away with it.

Think back to your childhood. I think back to mine. I think about my mother giving me the advice to don't count your chickens before they are hatched. That's exactly what Mr. Garza did, he counted his chickens. He thought he had gotten away with it. He thought that Mom still had the banger in the car that she had picked up from the impound lot.

When this case started, during opening, I told you that I would ask you to return a guilty verdict on all three counts. You've heard now the Court provide you with the primary instructions that you have to follow during your

deliberations.

And on page 4 of that instruction packet that's in front of you, he read page 4, paragraph 4. He talked about what it means to prove something beyond a reasonable doubt. It is the government's burden, ladies and gentlemen, to prove every element of the crime charged, beyond a reasonable doubt. And then he defines reasonable doubt.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond all possible doubt. Possible doubts or doubt based purely on speculation are not reasonable doubts. A reasonable doubt is a doubt based on reason and common sense. It may arise from the evidence, the lack of evidence, or the nature of the evidence.

Common sense. Common sense.

Now, the Court has provided you with the elements of all the offenses, the three elements of the three counts, and we're going to talk about each one of them and talk about what it means to prove them beyond a reasonable doubt.

So let's look first at Count 1, possession of a firearm by a prohibited person. The elements are listed there on page 14 of the packet. They start at capital letter A. The first element is that the defendant had been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for more that are one year. The parties agree.

Second, that the defendant, following his

conviction, knowingly possessed a firearm or the ammunition specified in the indictment. We're going to come back to that.

Third, that at the time the defendant possessed the firearm, he knew the -- he knew he had been convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for more than one year.

Again, check it off, the parties agree.

And then fourth, that the specified firearm crossed state line prior to the alleged possession. The parties agree, you can check that off.

So Count 1 comes down to whether or not the defendant knowingly possessed the firearm and the ammunition. And remember during opening, I talked about two key questions to pay attention to during — throughout this trial. I said the first one was whether Garza knowingly possessed a firearm and ammunition.

Now, you've heard the instructions about actual possession and about constructive possession. I like to use an analogy. I currently am possessing this pen. Is this my pen? It is in my possession. I also have a pen -- well, there is one in my bag, there is one right here, this pen right here. I possess that pen. This pen that I'm holding, this is actual possession. That pen over there is constructive possession. And you know what, I probably have a pen back in my office. In fact, I know I do, it is sitting

in a coffee cup on my desk. I possess that pen, too. That's 2 my pen. 3 All of those are forms of possession. We don't have to prove that the defendant had the gun in his hand. We 4 5 are telling you it was in the engine compartment, but that's where he possessed it. 6 7 Let's talk about the second count, because really, 8 the second count and the first count, they kind of come down 9 and boil down to the same issue. 10 The elements of the second count are listed on 11 page 16 of your packet. The first element is that the 12 defendant knowingly possessed a firearm. Well, that's what 13 we have to figure out. 14 Second, that the firearm has moved from one state 15 to another. Again, the parties agree, check it off. 16 Third, that the manufacturer's serial number of the firearm had been removed, obliterated or altered. 17 18 And fourth, that the defendant knew the serial 19 number had been removed, obliterated or altered. 20 The parties don't agree on those. 21 Would you pull up Government's Exhibit 5E? 22 So you're going to have to decide whether or not 23 this firearm had an obliterated serial number, whether that 24 serial number was -- I want to get this wording 25 right -- removed, obliterated or altered. And you are going

to have to decide whether anyone who would have possessed this gun would have known that the firearm (sic) was removed, obliterated or altered.

I'm going to ask Mr. Orvis to stand up and demonstrate for you or show you Government Exhibit 5F. Why don't you start down here, with juror number 1, and we go all the way to juror number 14.

So really the crux of this case is about possession. It's about whether the defendant knowingly possessed firearm and ammunition.

Would you pull up the timeline?

Now, this next exhibit, as the Court instructed, it is not an exhibit, it is an aid -- a visual aid, and it is a timeline of the conduct in this case.

So here, first we have November 26th, 2020, that's the day the police arrest Mr. Garza in the Meijer parking lot. That's the day they do an inventory search of the car, and they find a nine-millimeter bullet and they find two strips of Suboxone underneath the driver seat. It wasn't a .380-caliber bullet they found; it was a nine-millimeter bullet.

That's also the day they search Mr. Garza's pocket and find Suboxone in his pocket. We are not really focused on that now; we're going move to Count 3 in a minute. But the ammunition is important. It's the day Mr. Hutchins

```
says -- you can take Mr. Hutchins -- you assess his credibility, but in the parking lot, he tells the officer, hey, there's a gun in the car and the officer looks, and then he interviews, and then he looks again. And that's the day, on Thanksgiving, that he finds the gun in the engine compartment, in a black mesh bag underneath the battery. It is also the day that Mr. Hutchins is interviewed -- Mr. Hutchins and Mr. Garza.

So Garza's interview, you've seen clips of it, it is recorded. You have seen him talk about my car, my title, my belongings, all my stuff was in that car, my weight vest, my butane, my marijuana, which again, that's -- who cares about marijuana, right? That's not what we're talking about
```

We don't know when -- we know that from Mr. -- the testimony earlier this morning, that Mr. Parkes sold that car to Reggie Allen back in November -- or around November of 2019. We don't know what happened with who owned it or anything like that. We know that when the police impounded the car, the registered owner was Mr. Parkes. We don't know the rest, it's not in evidence.

today. We're talking about things that Mr. Garza owns that

are in my car. Reggie doesn't give him a ride to Meijer, he

gives Reggie a ride to Meijer.

That Thanksgiving, he tells Officer Fisher how he bought the car. He got some unemployment payments, his

ex-girlfriend helped him with it, and that's how he got the money to buy my car.

Now, let's talk a little bit about Mr. Hutchins. He came in here wearing a jail uniform -- jail garb, and he is pending sentencing right now, for a carjacking. As prosecutors, we have an expression, we say to juries like you that we wish we could call priests and rabbis in cases, but that's not who our witnesses are. The reference is to people that haven't committed crimes, that have had -- that aren't going to show up wearing a prison jumpsuit or jail jumpsuit. That's not whom -- that's not who Mr. Hutchins is. It is on you to decide, you know, what -- what credibility you want to give his testimony.

But there are some things that are kind of corroborated. He says he was on Clancy that morning. He says he saw a gun. He said he didn't remember if it was a .380 or a nine, but it looked like the gun we showed you in the picture.

Could you pull up Government Exhibit 5C?

It was black, semiautomatic pistol he said. Looked like this one, with the extended magazine.

He also talked about a whip. He said that that's a slang reference to a car. Now, some people know that, some people don't. But you heard it from Mr. Hutchins, take it for what it's worth.

```
Could you go back to the timeline?
 2
              Now, this is a broad timeline, but there's a lot of
 3
     stuff going on the 26th of 2020 of November. There's a lot
     of stuff. You could have a timeline, in your own mind, at
 4
 5
     least of the things that happened that day. Meet up at
     Clancy. Drive to Meijer. Get arrested. Search of
 6
 7
     Mr. Garza's person. Search of the vehicle. Interview with
 8
     Mr. Garza. Search of the vehicle again.
 9
              Remember that second search, that's the one where
10
     they find the qun. You heard testimony about where Mr. Garza
11
     was for the first search; he was in the Meijer parking lot.
12
     He didn't see him find a gun. Now, Officer Fisher found a
13
     bullet and he had information from Robert Hutchins that there
14
     was gun in the car, so he tried a ruse, he tried a bluff. He
15
     asked, whose gun did I find? And today, you heard his
16
     answer. It wasn't my gun, but I didn't see Reg or them get
     in my car with no gun.
17
18
              Can you play that exhibit again? I think it is
19
     either 15C or D.
20
               (Video played for the jury.)
21
              MR. DePORRE: Nope, not that one.
22
               (Video played for the jury.)
23
              MR. DePORRE: I was looking at them when they got
24
     in my car. He wasn't looking at them when they got in his
25
               The ruse doesn't work, he admits it.
```

```
Officer Fisher moves on. He starts showing pictures of
 2
     things he did find in the car; he shows him a picture of a
 3
     bullet and some other stuff that he found. Mr. Garza goes
 4
     off to jail. And then in that timeline in your mind, is that
 5
     second inventory search in the impound lot, and that's when
 6
     they find the gun.
 7
               Now, would you pull the timeline up again?
 8
               That sums up November 26th. There's a lot, but
 9
     that kind of sums it up.
10
               We move on to December 10th, that's the day that
11
     Mr. Garza's mother, Dominga Flanagan. Remember you saw the
12
     birth certificate; you saw the marriage license. You saw
13
     Brett -- excuse me, Detective Orvis' or Sergeant Orvis'
14
     testimony that he turned over property to Mr. Garza's mother,
15
     Dominga Flanagan. That's the day Ms. Flanagan picks up the
16
     car. The vehicle is released. The vehicle release is signed
17
     to her.
18
               Could you pull up Government's Exhibit 7?
19
               There it is, at the bottom.
20
               Would you zoom in on the bottom-half where it says,
21
     released to Dominga Flanagan with notarized letter.
22
               There is a notarized letter that she presents. And
23
     you heard the testimony, she has to present a copy of the
24
     title or title and a notarized letter. We don't know where
25
     she got the title from. Did she go back in the car? Did the
```

```
police give it to her? That's not in evidence. We don't
 2
            But you heard the testimony that that's what's
 3
     required. She presents a notarized letter and the title.
               And then the jail call.
 4
 5
               Go back to the timeline, please.
               December 16, 2020. You have heard clips from the
 6
 7
     jail call. We started with the first clip that you heard,
 8
     where he references it twice.
 9
               Would you play Government Exhibit 11C?
10
               He says, my mom got my whip. We know what whip
11
     means, car. My mom got some money that's owed me. My mom
12
     got one of my bangers, the one with the stick in it. And we
13
     know from Special Agent Hurt, the ATF guy, the guy familiar
14
     with firearm terms, the guy that knows the precise
15
     measurement of a .380-caliber bullet and a 9 nine-millimeter
16
     bullet.
17
               Could you play 11C?
18
               (Audio played for the jury.)
19
               MR. DePORRE: Would you go back to the timeline.
20
     We're asking a lot of technology, but we have a phenomenal
21
     assistant here. Thank you.
22
               That's -- excuse me. That's December 16th, 2020,
23
     and then you've heard testimony that Mr. Garza isn't charged
24
     with the gun until June 11th, 2021. You heard Officer Fisher
25
     testify he never went back after he found the gun and
```

interview Mr. Garza, he didn't tell him, hey, I did find that gun. So what did Mr. Garza believe when he made that jail call to Madison Merrill?

Now, defense has had some themes throughout the trial, and he's going to have an opportunity to speak to you. And one of things I want to caution you against is, don't look at each particular piece of evidence in isolation. Look at all the evidence that has been presented at trial and make your determination based on that.

One of the themes the defense has raised is, well, that call, that's tough talk. That's braggadocios. If you get me out, I've got my banger with my stick, I can protect you. He's trying to convince his girlfriend to pony up the 500 bucks to get him out of jail. Ask yourself if that fits with all the other evidence, or if the context of the call fits with the evidence that, no, that's his banger, that's one with the stick in it, in his mom's car, that's his.

Another theme that kind of arose was Officer
Fisher, he was sloppy that first time he looked in the car.
He missed the mesh bag right under the battery. Well, does
that mean that Mr. Garza didn't possess it? I mean, maybe he
should have been more thorough with the search. Maybe he did
exactly what the protocol is, but it doesn't matter, it
doesn't matter. That doesn't impact whether or not he

possessed the firearm.

Another topic that has been raised; banger could mean something else. Banger could mean a syringe that he was talking about. Well, he says banger, twice. You heard — you heard Hutchins say banger is a term for gun. You heard from the Special Agent who's talked to multiple people in Flint about guns and firearms, he told you what banger means. And you have the context of the call.

Here is another theme, the ruse, Fisher's ruse.

Well, why would he say he had a banger in the car if he had heard already from Officer Fisher that they had found the banger, they had found the gun? It must not mean gun. Well, Garza didn't watch the second search. He was present for the first one, and he didn't see a photo of the gun when Officer Fisher showed him things on his phone, the things he had seized from the car, and he wasn't charged with the gun until June 11th, 2011 (sic).

I'm asking you to not take apart every piece of evidence and view it as a discrete independent thing. I'm asking to you look at all the evidence. You can pick apart, you know, one particular thing. Maybe it would make sense — tough talk might make sense, if his mom didn't pick up the car. If it wasn't the Metro Police that searched it. So look at things in the context of the evidence that's before you.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
Now, we have talked a lot about Counts 1 and 2, and
I need to spend some time on Count 3. Let's discuss Count 3,
which charges possession with intent to distribute
buprenorphine. It just kind of rolls off the tonque,
buprenorphine.
         The first element -- and these are on page 17. I'm
going to say, buprenorphine, a few more times. The first
element is the defendant knowingly possessed buprenorphine.
Second, that the defendant intended to distribute
buprenorphine. And then down below that, there is a
discussion about what it means to prove that he knowingly
presented it -- or knowingly possessed it. This is on B on
that page, right, sort of down here. He had to know it was a
controlled substance.
         And would you pull up Government exhibit 1 -- I
guess it is 1B?
         He knew it was buprenorphine if he knew it was a
controlled substance that says -- that's knowingly possessed
it.
         Would you scroll in -- can you zoom in on the tab?
Maybe get a big box there.
         Well, it says it right on there, buprenorphine and
naloxone. And then it says here, RX only, prescription only.
         So this one kind of boils down to that same issue,
which is the issue of whether he -- and this is what we
```

```
raised at opening, did he intend to distribute Suboxone?
 1
                                                                We
 2
     stipulated that the Suboxone packs contain buprenorphine.
 3
     Did he intend to distribute it?
 4
               And, again, on your instructions -- you can keep
 5
     going back to these, because they have some helpful
 6
     definitions. What the intent to distribute means is written
 7
     there in C; whether or not the defendant intended to deliver
 8
     or transfer a controlled substance sometime in the future.
 9
     The defendant said exactly what he planned to do with the 19
10
     doses of buprenorphine. He told Officer Fisher. He claimed
11
     he took Suboxone. He claimed he lied to his doctor and said
12
     that he needed two doses per day, but in reality, he only
13
     needed one, that two doses would make him sick, but he got
14
     two and he sold the rest for extra money.
15
               Would you play the clip 4C?
16
               (Audio played for the jury.)
17
               MR. DePORRE: Now, just a brief disclaimer. You've
18
     heard this disclaimer throughout, but this case isn't about
19
     marijuana, it's about buprenorphine.
20
               Listen to what he says there. In his own words he
21
     intends to distribute some of the buprenorphine, maybe not
22
     all of it, but he's going to take some, he's going to get rid
23
     of some. He's got 19 tabs, total; 17 in his right-front
24
     pants pocket and two under the seat -- under the driver's
25
     seat where he's sitting in his car, the car that he says is
```

```
his car, and where the nine-millimeter bullet is. He wants
 2
     extra money, that's what he says. He's selling them for
 3
     extra money.
 4
               Well, he's got some money, he has $810 in cash in
 5
     his pocket. Remember, we heard from Officer Fisher about the
 6
     denominations, it wasn't all $100 bills. There weren't
 7
     any $100 bills. There was a 50, mostly 20s and some other
 8
     denominations.
 9
               Ladies and gentlemen, Noe Garza is in business.
10
     He's walking around, he's got a cash register in his left
11
     pocket, and he's got his inventory in his right, and he's got
12
     two more tabs that fell out underneath the seat of the
13
     driver's car.
14
               Let's talk about some points raised by the defense.
15
     It doesn't matter how addictive Suboxone is. It doesn't
16
     matter whether or not you can overdose. Those aren't things
17
     that are elements that need to be proved by the government.
18
     So you've heard some evidence that Suboxone, when prescribed
19
     by a licensed provider, is used to treat opioids -- people
20
     that are opioid dependent, people that have addiction, and
21
     that it also can be used for pain management.
22
               But you also heard testimony that Noe Garza doesn't
23
     have a prescription for Suboxone.
24
               Would you pull up Government Exhibit 8?
25
               This is Noe Garza's MAPS report. It shows his
```

prescriptions. He doesn't have a prescription for buprenorphine.

Would you scroll through to the next page?

Now, the defense also talked about free samples. But Ms. Cortes testified, the MAPS witness, the person who came down here from Lansing to talk about what MAPS is and tell us about that exhibit. You will have to rely on your memory, but she talked about who is required to enter a prescription into MAPS, and her testimony was that the dispensing provider has an obligation to enter it into MAPS. The dispensing provider, doesn't matter if it's a doctor or doesn't matter if it's a pharmacy, whoever dispenses the controlled substances, has to enter it.

Guess what? It doesn't really matter where he got it. It doesn't matter where he got it. What matters is. Did he intend to distribute it? So, you know, if the claim is that these are free samples and he's -- he got lucky, because he got a stack of 19 free samples and he's passing them out to other friends. Well, ladies and gentlemen, that meets the elements, that meets the elements of this crime. You can decide whether or not the evidence shows that those are free samples, but the evidence here is that those strips, those tabs that are Government Exhibit 1B, those are buprenorphine, and the defendant said he's selling them for extra money.

Go to 1B. All right. Thank you. You can take it down.

So we are left with three crimes, all with their own independent elements that you have before you on the piece of paper. And what's critical is just the two questions: Did Mr. Garza knowingly possess a firearm? And did he intend to distribute Suboxone?

Now, Mr. Longstreet is going to stand up and give a concluding statement or a closing argument for Mr. Garza, and then I'm going to speak again, and then you're going to have an opportunity to deliberate. When you do that, don't rush. Think about all the evidence in the case, think about all the exhibits that have been presented. If you need to see an exhibit, you can ask, you can do that. Only the exhibits that have been introduced at trial you can't — it might be nice to hear other things, but really what's going to be subject to your deliberations is the evidence that was presented at trial. And then you will have an opportunity to discuss the case with one another.

Most importantly, the government is asking you to use your common sense. Remember that reasonable doubt — if it is a reasonable doubt, it has to be based on reason and common sense. The standard here is not all possible doubt. Use your common sense and return a verdict of guilty on the three counts.

```
1
               Thank you.
 2
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you, Mr. DePorre.
 3
               Mr. Longstreet.
 4
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                Thank you.
 5
               Again, good morning, ladies and gentlemen of the
 6
     jury.
 7
               THE JURY:
                          (Collectively) Good morning.
 8
               MR. LONGSTREET: This is the defense closing
 9
     statement. This is an attempt for us to summarize all the
10
     evidence that you have heard over the last two days.
11
     not, again, an attempt for us to pull the wool over your eyes
12
     or misconstrue a fact. But the responsibility of a defense
13
     attorney is to review the evidence presented by the
14
     government critically, to show you that the prosecution has
15
     not met their burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt.
16
               We held the prosecution or the government to a
17
     standard, a very high standard, of proof beyond a reasonable
18
     doubt. And over the last two days, you have had every reason
19
     to doubt all of the evidence in the government's case.
20
               First, I would like to talk to you about what the
21
     standard is. A reasonable doubt is a doubt that arises from
22
     the evidence, meaning what the prosecution has shown you, and
23
     it also arises from the lack of evidence, what the
24
     prosecution has not shown you. And over the last two days,
25
     the prosecution has failed in every attempt to show that my
```

client was in constructive possession of a firearm and also that he possessed with the intent to deliver Suboxone.

Now, the standard that the prosecution must show is that the evidence proves to you, or the evidence is so convincing that you would not hesitate to rely on it in making decisions in your own lives. The question becomes, would you bank your life on this evidence? And we would submit to you that you would not. If the evidence does not convince you beyond a reasonable doubt, then you should say so by voting not guilty on all counts.

Now, what, exactly, was the evidence that we needed to look at? The first question becomes constructive possession. Did Mr. Garza have a right to have physical control over the firearm? Did he know he had the right to exercise physical control over the firearm? And did he intend to exercise physical control over that firearm?

Now, the prosecution has presented to you multiple witnesses in this case, and they have presented to you evidence in this case. And the first and most critical piece of evidence that they try to present to you is a phone call by Mr. Garza. First, they tell you that on

November 26th, 2020, my client -- asked my client -- or he bluffed Mr. Garza, we found the gun. Whose gun is it? My client doesn't know, and to this day, he still doesn't know. And the government hasn't shown you that he knew the firearm

was under the hood of that car.

Secondly, they want to tell you that on

December 16th, 2020, that Mr. Garza made this grand admission
that that burner -- that banger is mine. I still got the
stick. Well, on November 26th, he's told they found a gun.
But the government wants you to believe that 20 days later
he's telling his girlfriend that they didn't find a gun that
he knew they found. Would you bank your life on that? Are
you so convinced that you would make a decision in your
everyday life on conflicting evidence? The government is
trying to piece what they want you to believe it is, versus
what it actually is. Let's not be confused about what this
really is.

They want you to believe that he meant, when he said banger, he was talking about gun. Well, I find that kind of strange and this is the reason why. Well, if he meant to say gun, he would have just said gun, like he did during his conversation with his girlfriend. Now, the government didn't want to play that particular piece of phone call to you, because it doesn't fit in their grand scheme of what they believe this evidence is, so they didn't play the portion of a phone call where my client says gun and meant gun.

So they bring you an ATF agent who tells you what banger means, but here's the problem, banger has got a lot of

meanings. This one particular person tells you it is a gun, when he's talking about somebody else's gun. We heard in the phone call him say they can't put a green light on me, they ain't got no gun to put a green light on me.

The officer -- the ATF agent says to you, well, when he says gun that time, he's talking about somebody else's gun. Okay. Well, banger means gun, right? Well, only when he's talking about -- when he's talking about his gun is it a banger? But then he tells you banging on them means he's punching. So in order to bang on someone, don't you have to have a banger, which would be your hands?

Ladies and gentlemen, like the weapon of mass destruction, don't get confused what this is about. This is the government piecing what they want you to think this stuff means versus what it actually is. It doesn't make sense for a man to know they found a gun and then two days later — then 20 days later, tell his girlfriend they didn't find a gun that he knew they found. Was he talking about that gun? The problem is that question sits out there that the government has not answered, and it is not your job to do so. It is for them to answer that question. And if the answer is — if the question is unanswered, the verdict is not guilty.

Moving on, the prosecution wants you to believe that my client constructively possessed the firearm under the

hood of the car. First, it's not in the driver seat. It's not on his person. They didn't do any fingerprint testing. They didn't do any DNA tests. I'm going to let you know why that is important in a second.

But the gun is found away from him, we know that. There is no evidence, and they called a person to the stand, a co-defendant, to tell you that my client possessed the gun, but guess what that person didn't say? What happened to the gun after they left the house? This firearm that he allegedly saw my client with after they left the house, he didn't know what happened to it. And you didn't hear him say that my client put their firearm underneath the hood of the car. So who put it there?

Guess what, ladies and gentlemen, it's not for you to figure out. It's for them to show you, and they didn't. That's why DNA and fingerprinting is important. You don't get to give the government credit for not doing the work. You don't get to give the government credit for not doing the work.

We know this vehicle was owned and occupied by three people. Blake Austin Parkes, and Mr. Parkes has nothing to do with this case other than he sold the car. You have Meldrum Allen, an accused thief, heroin addict, who is in the store stealing, who Mr. Blake Austin (sic) told you he sold the car to. You have the other co-defendant,

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Hutchins, telling you that Mr. Allen was driving that car around. And then you've got Mr. Garza, who drove the car. The question is, out of those three people, who put the gun underneath the hood of the car? The only person who really had all the great details about it was the carjacker. It's not enough for the government to show you that my client had a gun. They have to show you he possessed this If he meant banger and stick, and stick and banger meant firearm with extended clip, guess what, that's not an extended clip, that's an eight-shot magazine. Mr. Hutchins told you that a stick was a 30-round He gave a description to the police that it was a .380 clip. with a 14-round clip. But guess what? Neither one of those is this gun. The government has to show you that my client

The government has to show you that my client constructively possessed this firearm. This firearm they failed to fingerprint, latent fingerprint, to determine who had the gun in their hand. No latent fingerprint testing on the bullets to see who had the bullets in their hands. No DNA testing on the firearm to see who held the firearm. This is not for us to do. We don't have a burden of proof. It's for the government to show you that my client constructively possessed it.

Now, you could believe the word of the carjacker, or they can actually get down to some science and do the real

job and identify who had the firearm. But they didn't do it, and because they didn't do it, it's not guilty.

Now, they bring in Mr. Hutchins. This young man was caught red-handed, stealing at Meijer. The subject of Fisher's investigation was him, Hutchins, who gets in the back seat of the car. Ladies and gentlemen, this is critical, he's left in the car by himself when the police get my client, Mr. Garza, out of the car.

Now, if you a gun-wheeling carjacker -- ain't my gun. The nine-millimeter bullet that ties -- supposed to tie my client to the gun is with this guy in the back seat. Now, are you going put it past this carjacker got a bullet and a gun. No. It's actually quite reasonable. The guy who visits you gets charged with carjacking, what does a gun have to do with it? Or may possess a firearm. But you don't have any bullets in this young man's pockets, in the front seat of the car, and they want you to say, oh, well, the stuff fell out of the pockets and stuff landed on the side of the car.

How many of you guys have kids and you find French fries, pennies, potato chips, GI Joe, all under your seat. You don't know how they got there. You didn't do it. It came out of the back seat. So is it reasonable that the carjacking -- oh, the police on the way, get rid of this, not my gun. Then what does he do? Gets pulled out of the car red-handed, it's him, it's him, it's him. And what did the

police do? They wanted to get done and go home.

So the United States government is asking you to convict him on this guy's word. Is this evidence that you would bank your life on it? Would you use this to make everyday decisions in your life? The word of a lying, stealing carjacker, who's got every reason in the world to lie, and got what he wanted, to get him in trouble, and to go home.

Now, the drug dealing piece, and this is actually the worst piece of the case. Just a little bit about myself. I grew up on the west side of Detroit, and after I got married, I moved home, across the street from my parents. And unfortunately, I lived next to a crack house two doors over, and I saw the heroin addicts running in and out of the house. I wish I had a drug dealer like Noe Garza. Hey, man, I got the Suboxone to get you off the heroin. I got the Suboxone.

Ask yourself, ladies and gentlemen, is it reasonable for a drug dealer to possess items that he's going to sell that are going help his customers get off of the product he sells? Is a drug dealer going to walk around selling a drug that helps his customer get off the drug he sells? Are you going to bank on that? Does that make sense to you? There's no evidence that he was intending to distribute. There's no evidence that he even knew -- can you

pronounce that for me, sir.

MR. DePORRE: Buprenorphine.

MR. LONGSTREET: Buprenorphine. How does he even know this young man knows that buprenorphine is in this stuff, and he's using it to keep himself from getting dope sick. We know Suboxone is a drug that helps users of heroin. So you mean to tell me, we got this grand drug dealer going around helping his customers? A drug that really don't get you high. A drug that really can't -- yes, it makes a difference whether it makes you high or not, because people sell drugs to people so they could get high. And if you are not getting high off of it, why would you be thinking he's

There is no other evidence to suggest that my client was a drug dealer because he possessed a drug that helped him get off of the drug that he was addicted to, heroin.

selling it for that purpose. Does this make sense to you?

Officer Fisher told you my client said, hey, man, I'm getting dope sick. I get sick. He got it for his own use. Now, how he got it? I don't know. But the question is, did he possess it with the sole purposes of going to make some money off of it or deal it like a drug dealer? The answer to that question, to us, is no.

Over the last two days, the government has attempted to bring to you evidence they believe would show

that my client was a felon in possession of a firearm. He was in possession of a firearm with an obliterated serial number. And he -- we admit he had Suboxone, but it's possession of Suboxone, not possession with intent to deliver Suboxone or buprenorphine. The issue is whether he intended to deliver buprenorphine, and Suboxone isn't all buprenorphine, it's a mixture of drugs. So could he have truly intended to deliver one drug, when that particular drug had more than one drug in it? Again, does that make sense to you.

This is the last opportunities you're going to have to speak to me. The government is going to stand up and they are going to challenge just about everything I said. But the fact will remain that what I said stays true. It is not an attempt to pull wool over your eyes, but simply view the evidence critically, to hold the prosecution to a burden of proof. And if they have not met that burden of proof, if they have not convinced you, your vote should be not guilty. We are asking each and every one of you for that vote, because this evidence does not convince you beyond a reasonable doubt that my client is guilty of any crimes in this case. You would hesitate to rely on it. You would hesitate to make the most important decisions of your life based on the evidence presented by the government, and because of that, we're asking you for the right verdict, the

```
just verdict, the proper verdict, not quilty all counts.
 1
               Thank you.
 2
 3
                          Thank you, Mr. Longstreet.
               THE COURT:
               Mr. DePorre, rebuttal for the government?
 4
 5
               MR. DePORRE: I'm not going to disagree with all
 6
     the things he said. I'm going to take issue with some of
 7
     them.
 8
               First, I'm not asking to you rely on Mr. Hutchins.
 9
     I'm telling you, give his testimony the weight you think it
10
     deserves, in light of your observations of Mr. Hutchins, and
     all the other testimony in this case.
11
               Mr. Longstreet has done a remarkable job of looking
12
13
     at discrete issues and picking them apart. He looks at the
14
     call. Mr. Garza, in the call, uses the word, "gun," to
15
     describe other gang members who put a green light out on
16
     them.
            They don't have a gun. He uses the word gun. And
17
     when he speaks with his girlfriend, he uses the word,
18
     "banger." It's not that he's trying to hide the words.
19
     are not saying that -- we are not saying that he's speaking
20
     in some complex code. It is just obvious to Mr. Garza what a
21
     banger is, it is obvious to the person listening on the other
22
     side of the call what a banger is. He could have said gun.
23
     We are not saying that was sort of cunning word usage by
24
     Mr. Garza to disquise what he had in the car. He's bragging.
25
     You know who he is? He's the guy that catches the touchdown
```

pass, he's running to the end zone, and he spikes the football, but he's not in the end zone yet. He's not in the end zone yet. They did find the gun. He's not afraid to say gun, he just says banger because he knows what that means and, evidently, the person who is listening to it knows what it means.

Now, he also talked about three people who owned the car. Ask yourself who put the gun under the hood? That's the question. Who put the gun under the hood? Blake Parkes said it wasn't him. He has never owned a pistol. He sold the car in 2019.

So you are left with Meldrum Allen, who looks, frankly, like a drug addict in the photo, and we've heard testimony that he did use drugs. And you are left with Noe Garza. It wasn't Reggie's car anymore, Noe made that clear, he had the money, he came up with the money to buy that car, it's his car, he saw Reggie get in the car, he didn't have a gun. He's the one in the driver's seat. He's the one who uses mesh bags to make keif.

We are not asking you to rely on any particular fact in this case. Is it plausible that banger means something in different contexts when he's talking about banging on people? Absolutely. He's talking about fighting. What we want you to do is look at all the evidence, view it as a whole, and make a decision, and we are confident that

when you do that, you will find him guilty.

1

2 Thank you. 3 Thank you, Mr. DePorre. THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, I'm going wrap up my final 4 5 instructions to you. 6 I earlier concluded the part of my instructions 7 explaining the rules for considering some of the testimony 8 and evidence. Now let me finish up by explaining some things 9 about your deliberations in the jury room and your possible 10 verdicts. 11 The first thing that you should do in the jury room 12 is choose somebody to be your foreperson. This person will 13 help guide your discussions and will speak for you here in 14 court. 15 Once you start deliberating, do not talk to the 16 jury officer or to me or to anyone else, except each other, 17 about the case. If you have any questions or messages, you 18 must write them down on a piece of paper, sign them, and then 19 give them to the jury officer. The officer will give them to 20 me, and I will respond as soon as I can. I may have to talk 21 to the lawyers about what you have asked, so it may take me 22 some time to get back to you. Any questions or messages 23 normally should be sent to me through your foreperson. 24 If you want to see any of the exhibits that were 25 admitted into evidence, you may send me a message and those

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

exhibits will be provided to you. One more thing about messages, do not ever write down or tell anyone how you stand on your votes. For example, to not write down or tell anyone that you are split six/six or eight/four or whatever your vote happens to be. That should stay secret until you are finished.

Remember that you must make your decision based only on the evidence that you saw and heard here in court. During your deliberations, you must not communicate with or provide any information to anyone, by any means, about this case. You may not use any electronic device or media or application unless specifically instructed to do so by this Court, such as a telephone, cellphone, smart phone, iPhone, Blackberry or computer, the Internet, any Internet service or any text or instant messaging service, any Internet chat room, blog or website, such as Facebook, MySpace, LinkedIn, YouTube, Twitter, Instagram, WhatsApp, Snapchat or other similar electronic service to communicate to anyone any information about this case or to conduct any research about this case until I accept your verdict. In other words, you cannot talk to anyone on the phone, correspond with anyone, or electronically communicate with anyone about this case. You can only discuss the case in the jury room with your fellow jurors during deliberations.

I expect you will inform me as soon as you become

aware of another juror's violation of these instructions.

You may not use these electronic means to investigate or communicate about the case, because it is important that you decide this case based solely on the evidence presented in this courtroom. Information on the Internet or available through social media might be wrong, incomplete or inaccurate. Even using your smart phones, tablets and computers and the news and social media apps on those devices, may inadvertently expose you to certain notices, such as pop-ups or advertisements that could influence your consideration of the matters you've heard about in this courtroom.

You are only permitted to discuss the case with your fellow jurors during deliberations, because they have seen and heard the same evidence you have. In our judicial system, it is important that you are not influenced by anything or anyone outside of this courtroom. Otherwise, your decision may be based on information known only by you and not your fellow jurors or the parties in the case. This would unfairly and adversely impact the judicial process.

A juror who violates these restrictions jeopardizes the fairness of these proceedings, and a mistrial could result, which would require the entire process to start over.

Your verdict, whether it is guilty or not guilty, must be unanimous. To find the defendant guilty of a

with.

particular count, every one of you must agree that the government has overcome the presumption of innocence with evidence that proves the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. To find him not guilty of a particular count, every one of you must agree that the government has failed to convince you beyond a reasonable doubt. Either way, guilty or not guilty, your verdict must be unanimous.

Now that all the evidence is in and the arguments are completed, you are free to talk about the case in the jury room. In fact, it is your duty to talk with each other about the evidence and to make every reasonable effort you can to reach unanimous agreement. Talk with each other. Listen carefully and respectfully to each other's views.

Keep an open mind as you listen to what your fellow jurors have to say. Try your best to work out your differences. Do not hesitate to change your mind if you are convinced that other jurors are right and that your original position was wrong. But do not ever change your mind just because other jurors see things differently or just to get the case over

In the end, your vote must be exactly that, your own vote. It is important for you to reach unanimous agreement, but only if you can do so honestly and in good conscience.

No one will be allowed to hear your discussions in

the jury room, and no record will be made of what you say, so you should all the feel free to speak -- you should all feel free to speak your minds.

Listen carefully to what the other jurors have to say and then decide for yourself if the government has proved the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. If you decide that the government has proved the defendant guilty, then it will be my job to decide what the appropriate punishment should be. Deciding what the punishment should be is my job, not yours. It would violate your oaths as jurors to even consider the possible punishment in deciding your verdict. Your job is to look at the evidence and decide if the government has proved the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

I have prepared a verdict form that you should use to record your verdict. You all have a copy of it, so let's look at it, if you would, with me, please. You can see the form begins by saying, "We, the jury, unanimously find the following" and that's to emphasize that any checkmark on here must represent the unanimous vote of the jury.

It says with respect to Count 1, it says with respect to the charge in Count 1 of the Superseding Indictment, which charges the defendant with being a prohibited person in possession of a firearm and ammunition, we find the defendant -- and your choices are not guilty or

quilty.

Then goes Count 2, and it says, with respect to the charge in Count 2 of the Superseding Indictment, which charges the defendant with being in possession of a firearm with an obliterated serial number, we find the defendant -- again, you have two choices, not guilty or quilty.

It then goes to Count 3, and it says with respect to the charge in Count 3 of the Superseding Indictment, which charges the defendant with possessing with intent to distribute buprenorphine, we find the defendant not guilty or guilty.

Then there is a line for the printed name of the person you chose as foreperson, and a signature, and the date.

If you decide that the government has proved any of the charges against the defendant beyond a reasonable doubt, say so by having your foreperson mark the appropriate place on the official form. If you decide that the government has not proved any of the charges against him beyond a reasonable doubt, say so by having your foreperson mark the appropriate place on the form. Your foreperson should then sign the form, put the date on it, and return it to me.

Remember that the defendant is only on trial for the particular crimes charged in the indictment. Your job is

```
limited to deciding whether the government has proved the
 2
     crimes charged.
 3
               Let me finish up by repeating something that I said
     to you earlier, nothing that I have said or done during this
 4
 5
     trial was meant to influence your decision in any way.
     decide for yourselves if the government has proved the
 6
 7
     defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.
 8
               Finally, remember that if you elected to take notes
 9
     during the trial, your notes should be used only as memory
10
     aids. You should not give your notes greater weight than
11
     your independent recollection of the evidence. You should
12
     rely upon your own independent recollection of the evidence,
13
     or lack of evidence, and you should not be unduly influenced
14
     by the notes of other jurors. Notes are not entitled to any
15
     more weight than the memory or impression of each juror.
16
     Whether you took notes or not, each of you must form and
17
     express your own opinion as to the facts of this case.
18
               All right. Let me briefly see counsel at sidebar.
19
               (Sidebar conference held on the record
20
               at 12:06 p.m. as follows:
21
               THE COURT: Mr. DePorre, any objection to the
22
     instructions as read to the jury?
23
               MR. DePORRE:
                             The government has no objections.
24
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                Sir, no, sir.
25
               THE COURT: So the defense has no objections to the
```

```
instructions; is that correct?
 1
 2
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                Sir, no, sir.
 3
                           I tried to ask that in a positive way.
               THE COURT:
 4
     Do you have any objections?
 5
               MR. LONGSTREET: Sir, no, sir.
 6
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
                                 Thank you.
 7
               (Sidebar conference concluded at 12:06 p.m.)
 8
               THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, the next
 9
     step is to pick the two folks who will be our alternate
10
     jurors. Ms. Ryan has poker chips with the numbers 1
11
     through 14 on them. She will draw two chips out of there,
12
     and the two folks sitting in the seat that correspond to the
13
     chip number be our alterative jurors.
14
               A couple points about the folks chosen as
15
     alternates. Your service continues, even if you are
16
     designated as the alternate, because sometimes we have,
17
     during deliberations, a juror falls ill, or we have a problem
18
     and we have to replace that juror with an alternate juror.
19
     So even if you are designated as an alternate, that means you
20
     won't deliberate right now, but you should not talk about the
21
     case with anybody until you hear from the Court that we have
22
     reached a verdict, and then you can talk to other people
23
     about the case.
24
               And because we ordered you guys lunch, I don't want
25
     the alternates to lose out on lunch. So this is what I want
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to recommend: We'll pick the alternates, and I suggest that you guys adjourn for your lunch. Do not talk about the case, at all, with the alternates there. Have a nice relaxing lunch. We got you lunch from my all-time favorite place across the street. Finish your lunch, then the alternates will excuse themselves, and only at that point should you pick your foreperson and begin your deliberations. deliberations with the alternates present, please. So have a nice enjoyable lunch. All right. Our first alternate is in seat number 1, that is Ms. Zatsick. And our second alternate is in seat number 10, that Ms. Tokarczyk. Again, you still are on duty, even though you won't be participating in the original deliberations. We will let you know when and if we get a verdict, but you can still enjoy the wonderful lunch. So the last thing I need to do is administer the oath to Ms. Ryan. Do you solemnly swear you will keep all members sworn upon this panel in some private and convenient place, and that you will permit no one to communicate with them, nor communicate with them yourself, except to inquire if they have agreed upon a verdict, until discharged by this Court, so help you God? THE CASE MANAGER: I do. THE COURT: Okay. Will you please take our jurors

```
out for lunch. Please do not deliberate until the alternates
     have excused themselves.
 2
 3
               THE CASE MANAGER: All rise for the jury.
 4
               (Jury excused at 12:09 p.m.)
 5
               THE COURT: All right. Please be seated. The jury
     has left the room.
 6
 7
               Mr. DePorre, anything on behalf of the government?
 8
               MR. DePORRE: No, Your Honor.
 9
               THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet, anything from
10
     Mr. Garza?
11
               MR. LONGSTREET: Nothing, no, sir.
12
               THE COURT: If you guys would not stray too far.
13
     And if you could make sure Ms. Monda has a way to contact you
14
     by cellphone if you are going to leave. We will let you know
15
     as soon as we hear anything, if we do, from our jury. So
16
     thank you very much. We are done with this.
17
               (Proceedings adjourned at 12:10 p.m.)
18
19
               (At 2:05 p.m. Court reconvenes; Court, counsel and
20
               Defendant present.)
21
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. It's 2:05. We are
22
     back on the record.
23
               Mr. DePorre, you are with us for the government.
24
     Mr. Longstreet, I see you and Mr. Garza have rejoined us as
25
            Thank you for coming back so quickly.
     well.
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I wanted to go on the record. We have a note from the jury. It was sent at 1:25, and it asks for certain pieces of evidence. They are asking for Exhibits 4C, 5B, 5C, and then 11B, 11C and 4B. They have little asterisks next to 11B and 11C and 4B with a note that says really want to see those. Then it also says picture of gun, 5F. And it is signed Brandon, the foreperson, and dated today. It was sent at 1:25.

So I wanted to convene and go on the record and talk about how to proceed. What I want to propose is the That we send back to the jury all of the tangible following: exhibits, the documents, the photos, stuff like that so they can review that in the jury look. But some of the exhibits they have asked to review are tape recorded evidence, and what I want to propose there that rather than sending the recording back to the jury room, that we bring the jury into the courtroom, that we empty the courtroom entirely of everybody other than the jury and Ms. Ryan, who would be here, and Ms. Ryan would play any of the audio exhibits they wish to hear and play it as many times as they want. jury would be instructed to merely listen while sitting in here, to conduct no deliberations, and then once they have heard the tapes, they could return to the jury room. they need to hear them again, we can do the same exercise.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to make sure that both sides are okay proceeding that way, or if there are concerns or objections, I would be pleased to hear those. Mr. DePorre, the government's position, please. MR. DePORRE: Your Honor, we have no objection with the proposal in terms of viewing the physical exhibits and the -- bringing the jury in to listen to the audio exhibit. There are also physical exhibits that are a firearm, ammunition and the Suboxone, and when you read those exhibits off, I didn't have a chance to make sure that none of those were included. THE COURT: Right. Good point. Under no circumstances do we send a firearm back. If they want to look at it, it would be the same deal; we will put it in the courtroom, and they could look at it here. We are not going to send a firearm back in the jury room, but I don't think then asked for that. So to be clear what would go back to the jury is the documentary evidence, not the ammunition, not the gun, not the Suboxone. All documents would go back. And the audio recordings and those three pieces of evidence would be in the courtroom if they wanted to look at them. MR. DePORRE: That sounds good. Would you mind running through the list again? THE COURT: Sure. Ready?

```
1
               MR. DePORRE: Yep.
 2
               THE COURT:
                           It's 4C, 5B and 5C. Then there is
 3
     picture of qun, 5F. And then the ones that were denoted
     "really want to see" were 11B, 11C and 4B.
 4
 5
               MR. DePORRE: All right. 5F is actually the gun
 6
     itself, it is not a photo of gun.
 7
               THE COURT:
                           It's the qun itself?
 8
               MR. DePORRE: Yes.
 9
               THE COURT: Now --
10
               MR. DePORRE: I mean, they will have photos of the
11
     qun that are going to go back in 5D and E, but 5F that could
12
     just be --
13
               THE COURT: So what we'll do is I'm going to tell
14
     them we'll send the photos back, but if they feel the need to
15
     look at the gun -- physically look at gun again we'll make
16
     arrangements for that. We are not going to do that right
17
     now.
18
               MR. DePORRE: Very good.
19
                          Mr. Longstreet, are you okay with that?
               THE COURT:
20
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                Yes.
21
               THE COURT: Everybody ready to bring in the jury,
22
     Mr. DePorre?
23
               MR. DePORRE:
                             Are --
24
               THE COURT: What I want to do is bring them in here
25
     and I want to instruct them in terms of how this will go, and
```

```
then we will all clear out.
 2
               THE CASE MANAGER: They will have to go out again
 3
     because they have to remove him.
               THE COURT: That's fine.
 4
 5
               Mr. Longstreet, you are okay with this way of
 6
     dealing with the evidence?
 7
               MR. LONGSTREET: Yes.
 8
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
 9
               THE CASE MANAGER: All rise for the jury.
10
               (Jury entered at 2:11 p.m.)
11
               THE COURT: Please be seated.
12
               I hope everybody enjoined their lunch from my
13
     favorite place in the western world.
14
               Ladies and gentlemen, we received a note from you
15
     asking to see -- to review certain exhibits. I wanted to
16
     just review with you briefly our plan for having you review
17
     the exhibits.
18
               First, what we've decided is that we will send back
19
     into the jury room all of the documentary exhibits, that
20
     includes photographs of stuff and the other documents that
21
     were admitted into evidence.
22
               With respect to the firearm itself, that's not
23
     going to go back nor is the ammunition or the Suboxone.
24
     there's photos of the firearm that were admitted as exhibits
25
     and those will be going back with you.
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We also received an indication that you wished to hear certain recorded evidence, and we have a procedure for doing that. What we are going to do is instead of sending the audio recordings back for listening in the jury room, we are going to clear the courtroom of everybody, including me, except Ms. Ryan, and she is going to play whatever recordings you guys wish to hear. But while she is with you, you are not to discuss this at all. This is just listening and telling her we want to hear 11B or whatever it is you want to hear, you just identify it. If you want to hear is again you say one more time. If you want to hear it ten times you say keep playing it. Absolutely no discussion about the case in Ms. Ryan's presence. Once you guys have heard all of the recordings that you wish to hear for this point, you will then go back in the jury room, and once you're back in there with the door closed you can then reconvene your deliberations and resume your discussions. If at a later point you need to hear more audio evidence again, not a problem, we'll bring you back in and we will do the same procedure. I won't bore with you why we do things this way, but that's the way we do. So what we'll do now is go through a process of clearing the courtroom, but for now we're going to put you back in that room, and once we are all out of here other than

Ms. Ryan, we will bring you back in and do that exercise.

```
1
     Thank you very much.
 2
               THE CASE MANAGER: All rise for the jury.
 3
               (Jury excused at 2:14 p.m.)
 4
               THE COURT: Okay. The jury is out.
 5
               So I'm going to ask if the marshals will return
 6
     Mr. Garza to the lockup. The rest of us will all clear out
 7
     of here.
               The only live person will be Ms. Ryan. She will
 8
     play the recordings that they asked, and then we will hand
 9
     them the documents to go back into the jury room. We will
10
     let you guys know if we hear from them again. Thank you.
11
               (Court recessed at 2:15 p.m.)
12
13
               (Court reconvened at 3:27 p.m.; Court, Counsel and
14
               Defendant present.)
15
               THE COURT: Please be seated.
16
               The record should reflect Mr. DePorre is here and
17
     Mr. Garza has rejoined us as well with counsel.
18
               We've received another note from the jury, and the
19
     jury has asked -- this is a note written at 3:15, and I will
20
     read it verbatim in the record.
21
               "Does Count 1 and Count 2 have to go hand in hand?
22
     So if quilty for one does that automatically mean quilty for
23
     the other?" And it is signed Brandon, the foreperson.
24
               Mr. DePorre, your thoughts?
25
               MR. DePORRE: I think it is an easy answer, but I
```

```
don't know how to get that answer to the jury. No, that they
 2
     have to assess each count independently, and they have to
 3
     find every element beyond a reasonable doubt for all three
 4
     counts if they -- for each count that they convict on.
 5
               THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet, your thoughts.
 6
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                I will have to say they have to
 7
     consider each individual charge individually.
 8
               THE COURT: So you agree the answer to the question
 9
     is no, they don't have to go hand in hand.
10
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                That's correct.
11
               THE COURT: So my proposal is while we are all here
12
     with Mr. Garza here, to call them in and on the record read
13
     this question out loud and then answer it in the way that we
14
     just discussed. Does that work for you, Mr. DePorre?
15
               MR. DePORRE:
                             It does.
16
               THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet?
17
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                Yes.
18
               THE COURT: Okay. Let's do it.
19
               THE CASE MANAGER: All rise for the jury.
20
               (Jury entered at 3:30 p.m.)
21
               THE COURT: Please be seated.
22
               Ladies and gentlemen, we have received a question
23
     from you.
                I want to read it out loud and then give you an
24
     answer.
25
               The question that you have asked is: "Does Count 1
```

and 2 have to go hand in hand? So if guilty for one, does that automatically mean guilty for the other?"

The answer to your question is no. The counts do not go hand in hand. Each count must be considered independently, and for each count you should determine whether as to that particular count the government has proven each and every element beyond a reasonable doubt. And, again, you should consider each count independently, and your decision with respect to any particular count is independent of and stands alone your decision with respect to any other count. So you are not boxed in if you decide one count a particular way, that doesn't in any way dictate how you have to decide any other count.

Again, the question with respect to each and every count is did the government prove each and every one of the elements beyond a reasonable doubt.

Before we send you back, let me just give you a sense of schedule. Generally when I have juries deliberating and there is an anticipation that the deliberations will carry over to the next day, I end the day at 4:00 p.m. to give everybody a chance to get out ahead of the traffic.

So in this case if you anticipate that your deliberations will carry over into the next day, let us know and we will end matters at 4:00. If you wish to stay longer and continue your deliberations, that's fine, but I don't

```
anticipate staying tonight past 5:00.
 2
               The main point here I want to emphasize is I don't
 3
     want any time pressure in any way to impact your
     deliberations. As I said earlier, you shouldn't reach a
 4
 5
     verdict just to end the day, just to get out of here.
 6
     stakes for both parties are far too high. So while I have
 7
     told you the schedule is for your convenience and for your
 8
     planning purpose, I want to impress upon you that the
 9
     schedule shouldn't in any way impact how you guys handle your
10
     deliberations.
11
               Okay. Let me see counsel at sidebar for one
12
     second.
13
               (Sidebar conference held on the record at 3:33 p.m.
14
               as follows:
15
               THE COURT: Mr. DePorre, are you comfortable with
16
     the way I answered the jury's question?
17
               MR. DePORRE:
                             I am.
18
               THE COURT: Anything else you want me to tell them
19
     now?
20
               MR. DePORRE: No.
                                  Thank you.
21
               THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet, are you comfortable
22
     with the answer?
23
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                Yes.
24
               THE COURT: Anything else you want me to tell them
25
     now?
```

```
MR. LONGSTREET:
 1
                                No.
 2
               THE COURT: Okay.
 3
               (Sidebar conference concluded at 3:33 p.m.)
 4
               THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, thank you.
 5
     Please return to the jury room and continue your
 6
     deliberations.
 7
               THE CASE MANAGER: All rise for the jury.
 8
               (Jury excused at 3:33 p.m.; deliberations
 9
               continue.)
10
               THE COURT: All right. The jury is out.
11
               Anything, Mr. DePorre, for the government now that
12
     they are gone?
13
               MR. DePORRE: No. Thank you, Your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: Mr. Longstreet?
15
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                                Pardon me.
16
               THE COURT: Anything for Mr. Garza now that the
17
     jury is out?
18
               MR. LONGSTREET:
                               No.
19
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
20
               (Court adjourned at 3:34 p.m.; jurors released at
21
               3:45 p.m.)
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATION
2	I, Robert L. Smith, Official Court Reporter of the
3	United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan,
4	appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United
5	States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the
6	foregoing pages comprise a full, true and correct transcript
7	taken in the matter of USA vs. GARZA, Case No. 21-20405, on
8	Tuesday, November 15, 2022.
9	
10	
11	s/Robert L. Smith
12	Robert L. Smith, RPR, CSR 5098 Federal Official Court Reporter
13	United States District Court Eastern District of Michigan
14	Dalla 07 (00 (000)
15	Date: 07/22/2023 Detroit, Michigan
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	